

GOVERNMENT OF INDIA


DEPARTMENT OF ARCHAEOLOGY

**CENTRAL ARCHAEOLOGICAL  
LIBRARY**

---

CALL NO. **891.05/J.R.A.S.  
24645**

D.G.A. 79.







THE JOURNAL  
OF  
THE ROYAL ASIATIC SOCIETY




1919

1919

THE  
JOURNAL  
OF THE  
ROYAL ASIATIC SOCIETY  
OF  
GREAT BRITAIN AND IRELAND

FOR

1919  
24645



A 345

PUBLISHED BY THE SOCIETY  
22 ALBEMARLE STREET, LONDON, W.

M DCCCC XIX

STEPHEN AUSTIN AND SONS, LIMITED



PRINTERS, HERTFORD

**CENTRAL ARCHAEOLOGICAL**  
**LIBRARY, NEW L. II.**

AGE: 141 ... 2.4.6 4.5 ...

DATE: 1911 ... 23. 10. 56 ...

NO. 891.05 / J.R.A.S.

# CONTENTS FOR 1919

## ARTICLES

	PAGE
I. The Decipherment of the Hittite Language. By S. J. CRAWFORD, B.Litt. . . . .	1
II. Yasna XLVII of the Gāthā(-a) Spēntāmāinyu rendered in its Sanskrit equivalents. By Pro- fessor L. H. MILLS . . . . .	15
III. The Society of Biblical Archæology. By F. LEGGE	25
IV. Four Assyriological Notes. By S. LANGDON . . . . .	37
V. Labour Songs in India. By W. COLDSTREAM . . . . .	43
VI. The Pahlavi Documents from Avroman. By A. COWLEY. (With two Plates.) . . . . .	147
VII. Moses b. Samuel, a Jewish Katib in Damascus, and his Pilgrimage to Medinah and Mekkah. By JACOB MANN . . . . .	155
VIII. The Legend of the Divine Lovers: Enlil and Ninlil. By THEOPHILUS G. PINCHES . . . . .	185
IX. A "Manichæan" Fragment from Egypt. By W. E. CRUM. (With a Plate.) . . . . .	207
X. An Ethiopic-Falasi Glossary. Edited and Trans- lated by HARTWIG HIRSCHFELD . . . . .	209
XI. Graves of Europeans in the Armenian Cemetery at Işfahān. By Lieut.-Colonel T. W. HAIG, C.M.G. . . . .	321
XII. Sagara and the Haihayas, Vasiṣṭha and Aurva. By F. E. PARGITER . . . . .	353
XIII. Pictographic Reconnaissances. Part III. By L. C. HOPKINS. (With Plate.) . . . . .	369
XIV. Portrait of Gosāñ Jadrūp. By ANANDA K. COOMARASWAMY. (With Plate.) . . . . .	389
XV. The Aryan Invasion of Northern India: an Essay in Ethnology and History. By JAMES KENNEDY . . . . .	493

	PAGE
XVI. Gesture in Sumerian and Babylonian Prayer. By S. LANGDON, Ph.D. (With a folding Plate.) . . . . .	531
XVII. On the Japanese Sotoba, or Elemental Stūpa. By JAMES TROUP. (With a folding Plate and Text-figures.) . . . . .	557
XVIII. The Legend of the Divine Lovers: Enlil and Ninlil. By THEOPHILUS G. PINCHES . . . . .	575
The Retirement of the Honorary Librarian. By F. W. T. . . . .	47
Fondation de Goeje . . . . .	48
Modern Language Research Association . . . . .	48

### MISCELLANEOUS COMMUNICATIONS

✓ The Work of Sir M. Aurel Stein, K.C.I.E. By VINCENT A. SMITH . . . . .	49
The Panjab Historical Society. By V. A. S. . . . .	61
✓ Anglo-Indian = Eurasian. By V. A. S. . . . .	62
Etymological Notes. By SAMUEL DAICHES . . . . .	63
Corrigenda. By T. G. PINCHES . . . . .	64
Sources of the Pali Commentaries. By T. W. RHYS DAVIDS . . . . .	231
The Plays ascribed to Bhāsa and the Matta-vilāsa. By L. D. BARNETT . . . . .	233
The Date of the Book of Job. By H. BEVERIDGE . . . . .	234
An Arabic Word quoted by Hēmacandra. By G. A. G. . . . .	235
A New Book in Maithili. By G. A. G. . . . .	235
A New Gaṅga Record. By LEWIS RICE . . . . .	236
Nalanda. By V. A. S. . . . .	239
A Note on the Chinese Atlas in the Magliabecchian Library, with reference to Kinsay in Marco Polo. By A. C. M. . . . .	393
✓ Khāravela. By RAMĀPRASĀD CHANDA . . . . .	395
Satiyaputra of the Asoka Edicts. By S. KRISHNASWAMI AIYANGAR . . . . .	581
Ethnology of the Philippines. By C. O. BLAGDEN . . . . .	584
The Date of the Book of Job. By VICTOR L. TRUMPER . . . . .	586
Graves of Europeans at Isfahan. By JOHN L. MYRES . . . . .	588
"Anglo-Indians" . . . . .	588

	PAGE
A Ladies' College in Cappadocia in the Third Millennium B.C. By A. H. SAYCE . . . . .	588

## NOTICES OF BOOKS

Sir JAMES GEORGE FRAZER. Folklore in the Old Testament. Reviewed by R. C. TEMPLE . . . . .	65
A. FOUCHER. L'Art Gréco-Bouddhique du Gandhāra. By M. LONGWORTH DAMES . . . . .	77
HOSEA BALLOU MORSE. The International Relations of the Chinese Empire. By E. H. PARKER . . . . .	91
HOO CHI-TSAI. Les Bases Conventionnelles des Relations Modernes entre la Chine et la Russie. By ALFRED E. HIPPISELEY . . . . .	98
Sir CHARLES J. LYALL, K.C.S.I., D.Litt. Some Aspects of Ancient Arabic Poetry, as illustrated by a little- known Anthology. By E. H. . . . .	102
JOSHUA ABELSON. Jewish Mysticism. By F. W. BUSSELL . . . . .	103
RAO SAHIB H. KRISHNA SASTRI, B.A. South Indian Inscriptions. By L. D. B. . . . .	104
Archæological Survey of India : Annual Report, 1915-16. By L. D. B. . . . .	104
Archæological Reports, India. By L. D. B. . . . .	106
Dr. RENÉ CROSTE. Le Svastika. By W. J. PERRY . . . . .	107
MICHAEL J. PUPIN, Ph.D. South Slav Monuments . . . . .	108
A. FOUCHER. The Beginnings of Buddhist Art, and other Essays. Translated by L. A. THOMAS and F. W. THOMAS. Reviewed by M. LONGWORTH DAMES . . . . .	241
JOSEPH DAVEY CUNNINGHAM. A History of the Sikhs from the Origin of the Nation to the Battles of the Sutlej. Edited by H. L. O. GARRETT, I.E.S. By V. A. S. . . . .	246
Rev. W. PETTIGREW. Tangkhul Naga Grammar and Dictionary (Ukhrul Dialect). By Colonel T. C. HODSON . . . . .	249
A. J. WENSINCK. Some Semitic Rites of Mourning and Religion. By H. HIRSCHFELD . . . . .	253



	PAGE
G. ANDERSON and M. SUBEDAR, B.A., B.Sc. The Expansion of British India (1818-58). By V. A. S.	258
PANNA LALL, M.A., B.Sc., LL.B., I.C.S. The Dates of Skandagupta and his Successors. By V. A. S.	260
A Gazetteer of Kulu. By H. A. R.	262
M. HENRI CORDIER. Edouard Chavannes. By L. C. HOPKINS	265
M. A. CZAPLICKA. The Turks of Central Asia. By HENRY BEVERIDGE	266
A. E. GRANTHAM. Pencil Speakings from Peking. By A. E. H.	269
Sir GEORGE A. GRIERSON, K.C.I.E., Ph.D., D.Litt. The Ōrmurī or Bargistā Languages, an Account of a little-known Eranian Dialect. By M. LONGWORTH DAMES	274
H. P. KRISHNA RAO, B.A. The Psychology of Music. By M. L. D.	276
A. YUSUF ALI. Traek af Indiens Kultur. Translated by DAVID GRÜNBAUM. Reviewed by C. O. BLAGDEN	277
ARTHUR CHRISTENSEN. Contes Persans en Langue Populaire. By M. GASTER	279
A. J. WENSINCK. The Ocean in the Literature of the Western Semites. By S. LANGDON	281
E. A. WALLIS BUDGE. Miscellaneous Coptic Texts in the Dialect of Upper Egypt. By W. E. CRUM	283
H. DODWELL. The Private Diary of Ananda Ranga Pillai. By R. C. CULLING CARR	285
Sir WILLIAM WILLCOCKS, K.C.M.G. From the Garden of Eden to the Crossing of the Jordan. By T. G. PINCHES	290
Bulletin de l'École Française d'extrême Orient. By H. A. R.	294
Revue d'Assyriologie. By S. LANGDON	296
M. L. DAMES. The Book of Duarte Barbosa. Vol. I. By R. C. TEMPLE	401
The Dance of Siva. By DOUGLAS AINSLIE	414
VINCENT A. SMITH, C.I.E., Litt.D. The Oxford History of India, from the earliest times to the end of 1911. By W. F.	420

	PAGE
A. BERRIEDALE KEITH. The Sāṃkhya System.— DOROTHEA JANE STEPHEN. Studies in Early Indian Thought. By L. D. B. . . . .	421
RAO BAHADUR R. NARASIMHACHAR, M.A. Annual Report of the Mysore Archæological Department for the Year 1918. By L. D. B. . . . .	423
ALFĪYU'BNU - 'L - ḤASAN 'EL - KHAZREJĪYY. The Pearl- Strings. Vol. V. By C. J. L. . . . .	423
G. R. KAYE, F.R.A.S. The Astronomical Observatories of Jai Singh. By A. S. D. M. . . . .	427
W. A. IVANOW. Ismaili MSS. in the Asiatic Museum. By E. DENISON ROSS . . . . .	429
Lieut.-Colonel D. C. PHILLOTT. Hindustani Manual. Third edition. By GEORGE A. GRIERSON . . . .	435
Lieut.-Colonel D. C. PHILLOTT. Colloquial English- Persian Dictionary in the Roman Character. By D. L. R. LORIMER . . . . .	437
Fuṣūl wa-Ghāyāt. By D. S. M. . . . .	449
A. J. WENSINCK. Bar Hebræus's Book of the Dove, together with some Chapters from his Ethikon. By M. GASTER . . . . .	593
Professor S. KRISHNASWAMI AIYANGAR. The Beginnings of South Indian History. By V. A. S. . . . .	596
EDMUND CANDLER. The Sepoy. By R. CAMPBELL THOMPSON . . . . .	599
RATAN C. RAWLLEY, M.A. The Silk Industry and Trade. By H. A. R. . . . .	600
Colonel S. B. MILES. The Countries and Tribes of the Persian Gulf. By P. M. SYKES . . . . .	601
R. CAMPBELL THOMPSON, F.S.A. A Small Handbook to the History and Antiquities of Mesopotamia from the Earliest Times to the End of the Sasanian Period. By D. L. . . . .	605
Recent Arabic Literature. By D. S. M. . . . .	607
Murray's Handbook for Travellers in India, Burma, and Ceylon. Tenth Edition. By V. A. S. . . . .	612
W. J. PERRY. The Megalithic Culture of Indonesia. By C. O. BLAGDEN . . . . .	614

	PAGE
RAI BAHADUR PANDIT GAURISHANKAR HIRACHAND OJHA.	
The Palæography of India. By J. PH. V. . . . .	617
C. H. H. MACARTNEY. The Dîwân of Ghailân ibn 'Uqbah,	
known as Dhu 'r-Rummah. By R. A. N. . . . .	619

---

### OBITUARY NOTICES

Professor L. H. MILLS. By L. C. CASARTELLI . . . . .	109
AUGUSTUS FREDERIC RUDOLF HOERNLE. By G. A.	
GRIERSON . . . . .	114
Professor JULIUS EGGELING, Ph.D. By A. A. MACDONELL	124
Professor ERNST WINDISCH. By A. A. MACDONELL and	
ROBIN FLOWER . . . . .	299
Dr. OTTO SCHRADER . . . . .	306
LEONARD WILLIAM KING. By R. CAMPBELL THOMPSON	625

---

### NOTES OF THE QUARTER

General Meetings of the Royal Asiatic Society	129, 307, 451, 627
Anniversary Meeting . . . . .	451
Presentation of the Pinhey Memorial Medal to Mr. H.	
Cousens . . . . .	627
Presentation of the Royal Asiatic Society's Public	
Schools Gold Medal for 1919. . . . .	637
Principal Contents of Oriental Journals . . . . .	131, 308

---

ADDITIONS TO THE LIBRARY . . . . .	141, 315, 479, 641
------------------------------------	--------------------

---

INDEX FOR 1919 . . . . .	655
--------------------------	-----

TRANSLITERATION OF THE SANSKRIT, ARABIC, AND ALLIED  
ALPHABETS.

TITLE-PAGE AND CONTENTS FOR THE FIRST HALF-YEAR.

TITLE-PAGE AND CONTENTS FOR THE SECOND HALF-YEAR.

TITLE-PAGE AND CONTENTS FOR THE YEAR.

ALPHABETICAL LIST OF AUTHORS FOR THE YEAR.

LIST OF MEMBERS.

# JOURNAL OF THE ROYAL ASIATIC SOCIETY

## 1919

### ALPHABETICAL LIST OF AUTHORS

	PAGE
COLDSTREAM. Labour Songs in India . . . . .	43
COOMARASWAMY. Portrait of Gosān Jadrūp . . . . .	389
COWLEY. The Pahlavi Documents from Avroman . . . . .	147
CRAWFORD. The Decipherment of the Hittite Language . . . . .	1
CRUM. A "Manichæan" Fragment from Egypt . . . . .	207
HAIG. Graves of Europeans in the Armenian Cemetery at Iṣfahān . . . . .	321
HIRSCHFELD. An Ethiopic-Falasi Glossary . . . . .	209
HOPKINS. Pictographic Reconnaissances. Part III . . . . .	369
KENNEDY. The Aryan Invasion of Northern India: an Essay in Ethnology and History . . . . .	493
LANGDON. Four Assyriological Notes . . . . .	37
— Gesture in Sumerian and Babylonian Prayer . . . . .	531
LEGGE. The Society of Biblical Archæology . . . . .	25
MANN. Moses b. Samuel, a Jewish Katib in Damascus, and his Pilgrimage to Medinah and Mekkah . . . . .	155
MILLS. Yasna XLVII of the Gāthā(-a) Speñtāmānyu rendered in its Sanskrit equivalents . . . . .	15
PARGITER. Sagara and the Haihayas, Vasiṣṭha and Aurva . . . . .	353
PINCHES. The Legend of the Divine Lovers: Enlil and Ninlil . . . . .	185, 575
TROUP. On the Japanese Sotoba, or Elemental Stūpa . . . . .	557



**The Proceedings of the Society of Biblical Archæology  
are now incorporated with this Journal.**



# JOURNAL

OF THE

## ROYAL ASIATIC SOCIETY

### 1919

---

#### I

#### THE DECIPHERMENT OF THE HITTITE LANGUAGE

By S. J. CRAWFORD, B.A., B.Litt., Professor of English Philology  
at the Madras Christian College

**A**MONG the most important results of philological research in recent years is the decipherment of the Hittite language by Dr. Friedrich Hrozný, Professor of Semitic Languages in the University of Vienna. Hrozný's account of his work is contained in the *Mitteilungen der deutschen Orient-Gesellschaft* (No. 15), and at the suggestion of my friend—now, alas, the late—Professor James Hope Moulton, I have summarized Hrozný's interim report for English readers.

The nineteenth century saw the decipherment of the Egyptian hieroglyphic writing and the cuneiform script of Babylonia, with the result that historians, instead of being entirely dependent for their knowledge of the ancient past on the records of the Old Testament, or the reports of ancient travellers like Herodotus, with the scanty references in Greek and Roman literature, can now go to the original sources, and are reconstructing the history of the ancient world in the light of the knowledge shed upon it by the constantly increasing store of new material obtained in this way. One thing, however, seemed to be clear, that there were in the ancient East



two great centres of power and civilization, Babylon and Egypt. What is implied by this statement can be seen in books like Maspero's *Struggle of the Nations*, Jastrow's *Civilisation of Babylonia and Assyria*, and H. R. Hall's *Ancient History of the Near East*.

But the honour of solving the third great problem has been reserved for the twentieth century and Professor Hrozný, though Hrozný's work rests very largely on the devoted labours of Hugo Winckler, as he himself is the first to acknowledge. The names of Jensen, Meyer, Sayce, Peiser, Knudtzon, Garstang, Weber, Thompson, and others are also deserving of honourable mention in this field of research.

We are already familiar, from the Old Testament, with the Hittites as a people living in Syria and forming part of the population of Canaan in patriarchal times. In Genesis (x, 15), Heth is mentioned as the eponymous ancestor of the Hittites, and in Genesis xxiii there are references to the children of Heth and Ephron the Hittite from whom Abraham purchased the field of Machpelah, in addition to many other references to the Hittites in various parts of the Old Testament. But until comparatively recent times few people had any conception of the greatness and importance of these "children of Heth"; still less did they imagine that they belonged to a nation worthy to rank with Babylonia and Egypt as one of the great powers of the ancient world.

The earliest evidence of their importance came from references in the Egyptian records to a people called Heta or Hete, which was identified with the Old Testament Hittim or Hittites. This name is given in the cuneiform inscriptions as Hatti, which is now recognized to be the correct form.

In 1906, Hugo Winckler discovered the capital of this people in a city which bore the same name as the people, viz. Hatti, on the site of the small village of Bogházköi,

which lies on the slope of a hill east of the Halys, and overlooks the road from Angora to Yuzgat. This village is about five days' journey east of Angora.

In 1888, a large collection of cuneiform tablets was discovered at Tell-el-Amarna in Egypt. These contain the official correspondence of two Egyptian kings of the Eighteenth Dynasty, Amenhetep III and Akhenaten, with their allies and governors in Asia, and date from about 1400 B.C. Here we find mention of the great Hittite king Šubbiluliuma (c. 1400); from later Egyptian sources we hear of another Hittite monarch Hattušil, who about 1270 B.C. concluded a treaty with the Pharaoh, Rameses II.<sup>1</sup>

The Hittite inscriptions, of which large numbers still remain undeciphered, are of two kinds. In the first place we have inscriptions written in a peculiar form of hieroglyphics quite different from the Egyptian type. Such inscriptions have been found in Syria (Hamath, Aleppo, Carchemish, etc.), and in Asia Minor (Bogházköi, Ivriz, etc.). Repeated attempts have been made to decipher these inscriptions of an unknown language in an unknown script, none of which has so far met with success. The other Hittite inscriptions are in cuneiform. To this type belong the inscriptions found on the clay tablets unearthed by Hugo Winckler, with the assistance of Makridy Bey, in his successful excavations at Bogházköi, under the auspices of the German Orient Society, the Imperial German Archaeological Institute, and the Imperial Osmanlian Museum at Constantinople. Between the years 1906 and 1912, upwards of 20,000 fragments and tablets were found, which left no doubt that they belonged to the archives of the kings of the Hatti, and that Bogházköi was the site of their capital.

These inscriptions belong to the fourteenth and fifteenth centuries B.C., and both historically and linguistically are of very great importance. Among other things they

<sup>1</sup> Cf. Hall, *Ancient History of the Near East*, pp. 341-68.

contain treaties concluded by the Hittite kings, and their official correspondence with other kings of the East. A more careful examination of the Hittite records<sup>1</sup> has shown that Hittite is identical with the language of Arzawa (probably in Cilicia), which, as we know from two letters in the Tell-el-Amarna archives, had extensive dealings with Egypt.

Hrozný has devoted himself to deciphering the language as well as copying the texts. As the cuneiform texts contain only one language, they had to be self-interpreted. Sentences containing proper names, and especially sentences in which Sumerian-Accadian ideograms and phonetically written Accadian words occurred, were of great assistance in the decipherment, because in such cases it was frequently possible to fix the meaning of the sentence completely, or at any rate partly. Starting from these it was possible to deal with phrases altogether phonetically written. The task was now to determine the most important forms, the structure, and the linguistic affinities of the practically unknown language of the Hittites. Hrozný has succeeded beyond expectation in determining most of the forms of the language, and has arrived at some assured results on the important question of Hittite's place among the languages of the world.

First and foremost, Hrozný believes that he can give definite proof that the Hittite language is Indo-European.<sup>2</sup>

<sup>1</sup> These tablets are now, for the most part, in the Imperial Museum at Constantinople. Hrozný divides them into three groups according to the places where they were found (A, B, and C). He himself has devoted most attention to group B, which was discovered by Makridy Bey in some rooms on the eastern side of the largest building of Boghâzköi. For a detailed description of the site of the finds, see Ed. Meyer's *Reich und Kultur der Chetiter*, pp. 20-22, where a plan of this building (which he regards as a palace) is given.

<sup>2</sup> A scientific periodical has been founded by Otto Weber under the name of *Boghâzköi-Studien* for the discussion of the scientific problems raised by the Boghâzköi inscriptions. In the first number, Professor Hrozný promises an exhaustive treatment of his results, of which we have only a preliminary sketch in the *Mitteilungen*.

The possibility of this being so first presented itself to him when he was able to establish the fact that Hittite has a present participle, whose nom. sing. ends in *-an* (also *-an-za*), but whose other cases in the masc. have *-ant-*, *-and-* + case-ending. Thus Hitt. *da-a-an* = giving; the nom. plur. masc. of this is *da-an-te-eš*. Comparison with the Ind.-Eur. participle in *-ent-*, *-ont-*, *-nt-*, *-nt-* (cf. Lat. *ferens*, *ferentis*; Gk. *φέρων*, *φέροντος*; Goth. *baltrands*) at once suggests itself, and we also see that the Hitt. nom. plur. *da-an-te-eš* is practically identical with Lat. *dantes*. Hrozný did not fail to consider the possibility of these correspondences being due merely to the influence of Ind.-Eur. languages upon Hittite, but careful consideration forced him to reject this hypothesis. His first rather wavering conclusion that Hittite was an Ind.-Eur. tongue was strengthened by his success in completing the paradigm of the Hitt. participle in *-ant-*, from which it was evident that the other cases had more or less exactly corresponding forms in the other Ind.-Eur. languages. Thus, the gen. sing. masc. of *hūman(za)* = complete, whole, is *hūmandaš* (cf. *ferentis*, *φέροντος*, etc.); the dat. sing. masc. is *hūmanti* (cf. *ferenti*, etc.); the accus. is *hūmandan* (cf. *ferentem*, *φέροντα*, where Gk. *a* = Ind.-Eur. *n*; for Hitt. *-n* cf. Gk. *-n* in *χρόνον*); the abl./inst. case is probably *\*hūmantet/d*, *hūmantit/d* (cf. *si-e-ia-te-it/d*, with which we may compare Oscan *presentid*).

Similarly, it is possible to arrive at a scheme of declension for the other Hittite nouns, which corresponds, on the whole, with that of the Ind.-Eur. languages. It is clear that Hittite has six cases (at all events in the sing.). The nom. sing. ends in *-š*, the gen. in *-aš*, the dat. in *-i*, the accus. in *-n*, the loc. in *-az*, which obviously correspond to the regular Ind.-Eur. case-endings. The Hittite plural endings *-eš*, *-aš*, *-uš* have also parallels among the Ind.-Eur.

languages, except that Hittite seems to have simplified the somewhat complex system of Ind.-Eur. plural endings.

Hrozný was next successful in discovering in *wa-a-tar*<sup>1</sup> what is most likely the Hittite word for 'water', and accordingly cognate with Eng. 'water', Gk. *ῥῶα*, etc. But the remarkable feature of this word is that the gen. sing. is not *wa-a-dar-aš* as might have been expected, but *ú-e-de-na-aš*, the abl./inst. *ú-e-de-ni-it/d*; so that instead of the -r of the nom. and accus. the other cases of the sing. have -n. But this very same feature is characteristic of the Ind.-Eur. languages. For example, in Gk. *ῥῶα*, the gen. sing. is *ῥῶα-τος*, where *a* is derived from Ind.-Eur. *n*.

The evidence is still further strengthened by the pronominal forms of Hittite, of which Hrozný gives many examples, but considerations of space allow me to reproduce only a few. Since pronouns belong to the oldest part of a language they are of special significance in settling the question of linguistic relationship. Among others we find:

I	(1st sing. nom.) =	Hittite <i>uga, ug</i> ; cf. Lat. <i>ego</i> .
me	( " dat.) =	" <i>anmug</i> ; cf. Gk. <i>ἐμῷ</i> , O.E. <i>mec</i> .
thou	(2nd sing. nom.) =	" <i>zig, ziga</i> ; cf. Gk. <i>σύ</i> . <sup>2</sup>
it, that	=	" <i>tat/tad</i> ; cf. Skt. <i>tat</i> .
which	=	" <i>kuiš</i> ; cf. Lat. <i>quis</i> .
what	=	" <i>kuit/kuid</i> ; cf. Lat. <i>quid</i> .
whoever	=	" <i>kuiškuiš</i> ; cf. Lat. <i>quisquis</i> .
anyone	=	" <i>kuiški</i> ; cf. Lat. <i>quisque</i> .
anywhere	=	" <i>kuwabikki</i> ; cf. Lat. <i>ubique</i> .

The parallelism in the case of the verb is equally striking. Hrozný has succeeded in establishing the

<sup>1</sup> Hrozný says this is probably better spelt *wa-a-dar*.

<sup>2</sup> On the particle -γε cf. Brugmann, *Kurze vgl. Gr.*, § 851.

present indicative of the Hittite verb *i-ia-u-wa-ar*, to make, whose personal endings may be compared with those of Greek and Sanskrit:

	HITTITE	SANSKRIT	GREEK
1st sing.	<i>i-ia-mi</i> , I make.	<i>yāmi</i> , I go.	<i>τιθημι</i> .
2nd „	<i>i-ia-ši</i> .	<i>yāsi</i> .	<i>τίθης</i> .
3rd „	<i>i-ia-zi</i> .	<i>yāti</i> .	<i>τίθῃσι</i> , <i>τίθητι</i> (Doric).
1st plur.	<i>i-ia-u-e-ni</i> .	<i>yāmāḥ</i> .	<i>τιθεμεν</i> .
2nd „	<i>i-ia-at-te-ni</i> .	<i>yāthā, yāthāna</i> .	<i>τίθετε</i> .
3rd „	<i>i-ia-an-zi</i> .	<i>yānti</i> .	<i>τιθέασι</i> , <i>τίθεντι</i> (Doric).

The adverbs also support the Ind.-Eur. character of Hittite. Compare: Hitt. *pa-ra-a*, before: Gk. *παρά*, etc.; Hitt. *kat-ta*, down: Gk. *κατά*; Hitt. *an-da*, within: Gk. *ἐνδον*, Lat. *endo* (cf. also *ἐντός*).

Some further remarkable coincidences in vocabulary may be adduced: Hitt. *a-da-an-na*, eating: Skt. *ádānam*, O.E. *etan*; Hitt. *a-ku-wa-an-na*, drinking: Lat. *aqua*; Hitt. *da-an-na*, present: Lat. *dōnum*, etc.; Hitt. *pétar*, wing: Eng. feather; Hitt. *wa-aš-šú-u-wa-ar*, clothing: Skt. *vasanam*, Lat. *vestis*; Gothic *garwasjan*, etc.; Hitt. *e-eš-mi*, am: Skt. *ásmi* < Ind.-Eur. *esmi*; Hitt. *ḫarmi*, take: Skt. *harāmi*; Hitt. *ši-ha-an-ti*, sacrifices: Gk. *σπένδει*, make a libation.

These are only a few specimens of the material, which Hrozný promises to treat exhaustively in his forthcoming work on the subject.

With such evidence before us there can be no doubt that Hittite belongs to the Indo-European family of languages; but it is possible to go even further and fix its position in that linguistic family.

On the basis of the development of the Prim. Ind.-Eur. gutturals, the Ind.-Eur. languages are divided into two divisions, called respectively the *Centum*-division and the *Satəm*-division; in the former the Prim. Ind.-Eur. palatals

$\tilde{g}h$ ,  $\tilde{g}$ ,  $\tilde{k}$ ,  $\tilde{k}h$  appear as stops, while in the latter they appear as spirants.<sup>1</sup> The *Centum*-division embraces the more westerly groups of Ind.-Eur. languages—Hellenic, Italic, Celtic, Teutonic, and the Asiatic Tocharian, recently discovered in Turkestan.<sup>2</sup> The *Satəm*-division comprises the more easterly groups of Ind.-Eur. languages—Balto-Slavic, Albanian, Thracian, Phrygian, Armenian, and Indo-Iranian (Aryan). In the *Satəm*-division no distinction is made between the Prim. Ind.-Eur. pure velars and labio-velars, which are kept distinct in the *Centum*-division; e.g. Ind.-Eur.  $*k^wis$  = Lat. *quis*, but Skt. *kāh*, who.

In Hitt. *uga*, *ug*, I = Lat. *ego*, Avest. *arəm* < Ind.-Eur.  $*e\tilde{g}(h)om$ , and Hitt. *kaš*, this = O.E. *hē*, *he*, Old Bulg. *se* < Ind.-Eur.  $*ko-$ ,  $*kio-$ ; while we find that Hittite has *kuiš* corresponding to the above-mentioned Prim. Ind.-Eur.  $*k^wis$ , Lat. *quis*. Dr. Hrozný promises further examples in his forthcoming book, but those already given are sufficient to prove beyond much doubt that Hittite is a *Centum*-language.

No one can have failed to notice how closely so many of the examples given above resemble Latin, so that Hittite must be placed very close to Latin. Hrozný thinks that Tocharian is the nearest relative of Hittite,

<sup>1</sup> The following table will make the development clear:—

Ind.-Eur.	Sanskrit	Greek	Latin	Teutonic	Old Bulgarian
$\tilde{g}h$	<i>h</i>	$\chi$	<i>h, g</i>	<i>g</i>	<i>z</i>
$\tilde{g}$	<i>j</i> ( $*\tilde{z}$ )	$\gamma$	<i>g</i>	<i>k</i>	<i>z</i>
$\tilde{k}$	<i>ś</i>	$\kappa$	<i>c</i>	<i>h</i>	<i>s</i>
$\tilde{k}h$	<i>c</i> ( <i>tś</i> )	$\chi$	<i>c</i>	<i>h</i>	<i>s</i>
$*\tilde{k}mtom$	<i>śatām</i>	$\acute{\epsilon}-κατόν$	<i>centum</i>	<i>hund</i>	<i>sōto</i>

<sup>2</sup> For an account of Tocharian, consult S. Feist's *Kultur, Ausbreitung, und Herkunft der Indogermanen*, pp. 428-31.

though Hittite also presents correspondences with Indo-Iranian, Balto-Slavic, and Armenian, and would explain the parallels by the geographical position of Hittite, which probably occupied a central position among the languages concerned. He also believes that he will succeed in showing resemblances between Hittite and Lycian, which was fundamentally at least an Ind.-Eur. language.

Lack of space prevents the reproduction at any length of the specimens of Hittite inscriptions given in Hrozný's monograph. It is only possible to give one or two of the shorter inscriptions:

(a) *Nu-NINDA-an e-iz-za-at-te-ni wa-a-dar-ma*  
 New bread will you eat; water further  
*e-ku-ut-te-n(i?)*.  
 will you drink?

The ideogram *NINDA* denotes "bread" in cuneiform script; *-an* is interpreted by Hrozný as accus. sing. In a sentence containing the word "bread" it was natural to look for a word for "eating", and this suggested a parallel between *e-iz-za-at-te-ni* and Lat. *edo*, Eng. eat. In *-te-ni* Hrozný sees the 2nd plur. pres. indic. act. (with future meaning); *nu* is paralleled by Skt. *nú*, Gk. *νν*, Eng. now. In *wadar*, as already seen, we have an exact parallel with Eng. water, where Hitt. *d* = Eng. *t* in accordance with the first consonant shifting. In connexion with "eating", it was easy to think of a verb for "drinking"; *-te-ni* has already been noted as the 2nd plur. act. ending. Hence we are left with a base *\*eku* closely resembling Lat. *agua*, water. The particle *ma* may be compared with Gk. *μήν, μά*, then, further.

The second inscription will be given without other comment than Hrozný's translation. It runs as follows:—

(β) *ták-ku amel el lum kát zu na-dš-ma*  
 When of a nobleman his hand or  
*šép šú ku-iš-ki du-wa-ar-ni-iz-zi, na-dš*  
 his foot anyone injures (breaks) he (that man)



<i>ma - a - an</i>	<i>kar - ma - la - áš-ša - i</i>	<i>nu - uš - ši</i>
if	cripple (?) remains	now to him
<i>20 zu kubabbar</i>	<i>pa - a - i ;</i>	<i>ma - a - na - áš</i>
20 shekels (?) silver	gives he.	If he
<i>u-úlma kar-ma-la-áš-ša-i</i>	<i>nu-uš-ši</i>	<i>10 zu kubabbar</i>
but not cripple (?) remains	now to him	10 shekels (?) silver
<i>pa-a-i.</i>		
gives he.		

It is now time to attempt to sum up the results of Professor Hrozný's discovery. In the first place it seems clear that in the fourteenth and thirteenth centuries B.C. Hittite was an independent Indo-European language, very closely related to Latin and bridging the gulf between the westerly *Centum*-languages and Tocharian, with which it has many affinities; at the same time it has points of resemblance with the *Satem*-languages, especially Indo-Iranian, Balto-Slavic, and, in part, Armenian. Owing to its position it has been greatly influenced by the non-Indo-European languages of Asia Minor, especially by that of the Mitanni and other pre-Hittite peoples.

Secondly, bearing in mind the danger of confusing racial and linguistic relationship, it appears probable that the Hittites were originally of Indo-European stock, but that in course of time they received large admixtures of non-Indo-European blood through contact with subject and neighbouring peoples. But in the second millennium B.C. there was in Asia Minor a highly advanced civilization, founded by an Indo-European people, rivalling Babylon and Assyria in its greatness.

They first appear in history in 1930 B.C. warring with Babylonia, and to them is probably due the overthrow of Hammurabi's dynasty. The Hittite empire culminated in the fourteenth and thirteenth centuries under Šubbiluliuma and his successors. At this time the power of the Hittites extended all over Asia Minor as well as over countries to

the east and south, like Syria and Palestine. They had intimate relations with Egypt.<sup>1</sup>

The strength of the Hittite empire appears to have waned about the beginning of the twelfth century B.C., possibly under the attacks of the great *Völkerwanderung*, which led to the settlement of Indo-European *Satəm*-speaking peoples in Asia Minor.

The original seats of the Hittites cannot be fixed with any degree of certainty. The close resemblance between Latin and Hittite points to their having entered Asia Minor by way of the Bosphorus, the road followed by their successors the Phrygians, Armenians, and, at a much later date, the Celts (Galatians). The Indo-Iranians probably entered Armenia and Persia by way of the Caucasus. Both Hittites and Indo-Iranians found their new homes peopled by races of non-Indo-European stock, represented by the Mitanni- and Harri (cf. Horite)-speaking nations. The brachycephalic type of Asia Minor and Armenia, as seen, for example, in the modern Jew, goes back to this pre-Indo-European population.

One very important result of Hrozný's investigations is that they enable us to fix, with some degree of accuracy, the date of the Indo-European invasion of Asia as about 2000 B.C.

The deciphering of Hittite has raised many problems for Indo-European philologists, and Hrozný's achievement ought to mark a new era in philological research. One would like to go on to discuss its importance for the question of the "home" of the so-called "Indo-European race", and its ethnological as well as linguistic bearings on this thorny problem.<sup>2</sup> It has certainly tangled the question of *Centum*- and *Satəm*-divisions. The remarkable resemblances between Latin and Hittite involve the problem of the connexion between the Italo-Celts and

<sup>1</sup> Cf. Eduard Meyer, *Reich und Kultur der Chetiter* (passim).

<sup>2</sup> Cf. E. de Michelis, *L'origine degli Indo-Europei*, ch. iii, pp. 84-137.

the Hittites and the period of the Italo-Celtic migrations in the West.

In another region, one would like to know what was the exact relationship between the Hittites and Minoans, and whether, as seems probable, it was the Hittite empire which kept the Minoans out of Asia Minor, and its downfall which smoothed the path of the Achæans. The Phrygians must have been in some way closely connected with the Hittites, probably in alliance with them, for it is hard to imagine the Hittites allowing a hostile power to establish itself in such an advantageous position as Troy.

I hope I shall not be regarded as guilty of utterly wild speculation if I suggest that the Hittite question is in some way or other connected with the obscure Etruscan problem. Herodotus is being rapidly rehabilitated in recent times, and he is no longer regarded as a credulous old wife eager to believe any wild story. He tells us that the Etruscans came from Lydia, and it is tempting to connect this statement of Herodotus with the Æneas legend and the suggestion it affords for the foreign origin of the dominant caste in early Rome. If the Etruscans were at one time rulers of Latium, it does not appear unreasonable to see some connexion between the Æneas legend and the Lydian origin of the Etruscans. It is a well-known fact that many peoples derive their origin from a god, and the Asiatic theory of the origin of the Etruscans receives support from the close similarity between the names 'Etruscan' and 'Tarquinius', and the great male deity of the Hittites, Tarku or Tarqu,<sup>1</sup> whose worship was widespread in Asia Minor. Is it possible that the Etruscans were driven to seek homes across the sea by the Hittite and Phrygian invasions of Asia Minor, and that Tarku was a pre-Indo-European deity whose worship was adopted by the conquering Hittites from their new subjects? This raises at once the

<sup>1</sup> Cf. Meyer, *op. cit.*, pp. 96, 134.

relationship of the Etruscans to the Minoans, and it is at least curious that Minos is said to have perished in Sicily.<sup>1</sup>

LONDON.

November, 1918.

<sup>1</sup> Since writing the above my attention has been directed by my friend and colleague, Mr. F. E. Corley, to Professor R. M. Burrows's remarks on this subject in the very suggestive chapter on "The Labyrinth and the Minotaur" in his *Discoveries in Crete*. Speaking of the Tursha, Tursenoi, or Tyrrhenians he says: "Do Pliny's 'Four Labyrinths' reopen the question (of their origin)? Do Egypt, Knossos, Lemnos, Clusium form a chain that takes us to the origin of that most mysterious of all peoples, the Etruscans?" (op. cit., p. 124 et seq.).

---



## II

### YASNA XLVII OF THE GĀTHĀ(-A) SPĒNTĀMAINYU RENDERED IN ITS SANSKRIT EQUIVALENTS<sup>1</sup>

BY PROFESSOR MILLS

<sup>1</sup> [Owing to the lamented death of the author the proofs of this paper have not received the benefit of his revision.—ED.]

*Ahura is besought to send Success and Immortality to the Representative Saint among His People, through His Holy Spirit and Its practical Influence.*

1. Śvāntena, kila puṇyena,<sup>1</sup> manyuna, vasiṣṭhena ca manasā,

(b) sacā rtāt(-te) cyautnenaca vacasā ca (-ā-)

(c) asmai<sup>2</sup> dhuh(-r)<sup>3</sup> (dāt) sarvatātī(-y-)-amṛtatve

(d) sumedhāḥ kṣatreṇa-(-ā-)-aramatī(-y) asuraḥ.

*Ahura is besought to work out this Blest Result by Means of Personal Propagation and the Gāthic Hymns sung widely, and through the Organized Devoted Labour of Aramaiti—He is thus the Father of His Saint (inspired by Asha Archangel of the Law).*

2. Asya manyoh(-ś) \*śvāntatamasya, kila, puṇyasya, vasiṣṭhaṃ (niḥ(-r)vahe(-d), nirvāhayet(-d))

(b) jihvāyā(-o-) ukthaiḥ(-r) vasaḥ(-r) āsā<sup>4</sup> manasaḥ(-o)

<sup>1</sup> As regards the word *spēnta*, which occurs throughout, I am now at last convinced that the word "bountiful" is here, as elsewhere, used in the sense of "holy".—What tended to the *augmentation* of the Good was sacred with this system. I had hesitated, fearing to suggest more meaning than was justified. I should continually repeat that I hold it to be quite impossible that the composer should use such words as the names of the Attributes, Asha, truth, Vohu Manah, Good Mind, Khshathra, Kingdom, etc., in their first simple meanings alone. Those meanings are indeed of primary and supreme importance;—see my treatment of them everywhere in my writings;—they are pregnant and altogether remarkable as grouped here;—but the hearers or readers must have been thoroughly familiar with the implied ideas which became inseparable from them—Asha as the Archangel of the Law, etc., Vohu Manah as "Good Will" in the faithful citizen, or in the Archangel, etc., Khshathra as the present immediate "national authority" in the Sovereign, etc.

<sup>2</sup> Here we have again the occurrence of this undefined word *ahmāi*. Do the Pahl., Pers., and Ner. solve this enigma by reporting *ahmāi* as the equivalent of Vedic *asmé*, dative or loc. of *aham*, "to us"? This is well worth considering, though *ahmāi yahmāi kahmāi cit* in Y. 43 is against it;—yet see strophe 3 here. Recall Y. 43, 1, etc., which shows that, as in the case of many other words used in the same way,

1. Through His Spirit, Bounteous-in-Holiness, and through His best will,

(b) in accordance with Asha, Archangel of His Law, and, practically, in both deed and word,

(c) may Ahura Mazda grant<sup>3</sup> to this<sup>2</sup> (One, Our Saint pre-eminent and representative) the two (eternal longed-for) Powers (the results of all our effort) that is to say, the Universal Welfare (with success) and the Deathless Long-life (here, with Immortality hereafter)

(d) (may) He, Ahura, (grant these) through His sovereign Authority (fully established in Our State now ever threatened) and through Aramaiti (Blest Angel of our holy Land, and of our field-toiler's wise devoted Zeal, on which all hangs).

2. And may He, Ahura Mazda, (fully) effect the best (the most beatified object) of His most bounteous-and-Holy Spirit's influence

(b) now through the tongue and (the inspired) hymns (the Gāthās) from the mouth of Our Good Mind(-ed One, Our Sainted Prophet)

the composer took it for granted that his hearers had especial means for understanding its allusions and point. The wandering contemporaneous teachers must have explained obscurities, as did the later rhapsodists.

<sup>3</sup> *dān* as improp. conj. aor. 3rd pl., hardly an acc. infin.; not impossibly put for the pres. part.—“may A. with the others give . . .”;—from this the 3rd plur.

<sup>4</sup> *Ēā nū*. Here we have again this deformity;—see Y. 29, 7. Possibly the letter *ē*, which is exactly the letter *n̄* reversed, has been accidentally turned around, so that we may have *ēn̄ā* = Ind. *ana* in the instr. = “breath” for “mouth”, so clearing up the difficulty. Or does it here represent a distorted *anu* which might express the force of *verezyat*? No such indication is given at Y. 29, 7. If the *pūmman* (*pūmā*) of the Pahl. is its attempted translation here:—see Ner.'s *mukhe-* and the Parsi-Persian *dahan* here, and *pūmman* (*pūmā*), *mukhena*, and *dahan* at Y. 29, 7,—then we should naturally reconstruct *aoiṇā* = “with mouth”, which so excellently fits the contents both here and at Y. 29, 7.



(c) aramatēḥ(-r) hastābhyām,<sup>1</sup> cyautnāni(-y) āviḥyāt,  
ā(-api-)varjet(-d),\* nirvāhayet(-d);—

(d) anayā<sup>2</sup> cittayā svaḥ (saḥ (sa)) pitā (-ar-) ṛtasya<sup>3</sup>  
((-ā) asti) sumedhāḥ.<sup>4</sup>

*Ahura gives the Cow, as the Supreme Gift of Our Prosperity, to our Representative Saint,—and to Her He gives the Pastures of Ar(a)maiti (as the Earth)—since She has sought the Highest Counsel.*

3. Asya manyoḥ(-s) tvam asi tena śvāntaḥ, kila, puṇyaḥ  
(-o),

(b) yaḥ(-o'sm-) asmai<sup>5</sup> gām raṇa-kṛtaṁ sam-ataksat,  
kila (-ā-), ataksah(-s) tvam;—

(c) āt \*se(?), (asyai), yavasa-bhumyā \*go-rāmayā saha  
dāḥ (-ā-) aramatim (apica),

(d) yat saṁ-vasunā sam(ā)prāksit(-d) manasā.

*The Holy Spirit afflicts the Evil, as He blesses the Good—  
The Feeblest good man helps on the Saint, while only  
the Evil helps on the Evil Cause. In spite of  
prominence that evil helper is accurst.*

4. Asmāt(-d) manyoḥ(-r) rerisyante dhvarantaḥ(-o)  
(dveṣiṇaḥ pāpāḥ(-s)),

(b)<sup>1</sup> sumedhasaḥ(-ś) śvantāt, (-d) ned itthā(-e), ittham,  
rtāvanaḥ;—(-o'lp-)

<sup>1</sup> “The two hands of Aramaiti” prove that she represents “Zeal” in agricultural labour. Recall Vendidad, 5, or 6, “with the right hand and the left,” etc.

<sup>2</sup> Ōyā. Here we have another of the ever-to-be-expected breakdowns.—  
Ō was expressed in the transitional Avesta-Pahlavi by the same perpendicular stroke † which also expressed “v” among other things. So that, making proper allowance for the unexpressed inherent short, or other vowels, we should reconstruct the word as *avayā* or *anayā*,—the Pahl., Pers., and Ner.'s Sanskrit each report the pronoun.

<sup>3</sup> An eminent Avesta-Vedist used to regard Asha as at times representing “the Congregation”.

<sup>4</sup> If we could read Mazdā voc. in *d*, then we might refer the whole passage to the typical saint; recall Y. 45, 3. See note;—and see my Latin Alternative in Gāthās at the place. Recall “better than the

(c) and with the two hands and vigorous work of Aramaiti (High Angel of our land and of our toiler's (wise and devoted) Zeal)

(d) and through such wisdom is He Mazda (verily) the father of Asha (Archangel of His Holy Law within His established State).

3. Of this Blest Spirit art Thou thus in this (*tena*) the bounteous Holy (One),

(b) who hast (\*in that Thou hast) for this One (Our signal Saint pre-eminent, and Representative) fashioned the (sacred) Cow, joy-giver (to us all).

(c) and also upon her, the Cow, hast Thou (for her support) bestowed together with the pasture fields of peace (Thine) Aramaiti (High Angel of Our land and of Our agriculture's wise devoted toil),<sup>6</sup>

(d) since she has taken counsel<sup>7</sup> (as to her tillage (see Y. 33, 6)) with Thy Good Mind(-ed One, Our tilling Chief, the Head and Representative of all Our agricultural interest, the centre of our civilization\*).

4. (a, b) From this Holy Spirit of Mazda (in Our hosts have we as well aggressive military help),—the faithless (foes) are wounded, (that is, injured and defeated in their career) from this Spirit;—not thus the Saint (Our typical true citizen).

Good", Y. 43, 2, or 3.—This *Valisstem* became later a name for Heaven, and it recalls also Y. 30, 4.

<sup>5</sup> *Ahmāi*. Perhaps, not unnaturally, Ner. seems to have felt the presence of something like the Ved. *asmé*, dat. or loc. pl. of *aḥam*;—he has *asmabhyam* = "to us". No trace of this in the Pahl. or Pers. N.B.—Ner. at times throughout offers independent suggestions, though his work is a translation of the Pahl. It is not a "mere echo" of the Pahl., though it might well be.

<sup>6</sup> The chief sign and essence of the difference between Zoroastrian (Zarathushtrian) civilization and the freebooting nomads was agriculture and close cattle-culture.

<sup>7</sup> See also elsewhere the frequent idea of "consultation". Cf. Y. 33, 6, — and recall Vendidad where *Ār(a)maiti* almost completely equals "the earth",—"the bride whom the true tiller husbands."

(c) alpabalasyacid nā (-ar-) ṛtāvane \*kātaye(-a),<sup>1</sup> āradhayitum (-tave), asat, (tat kṣamaḥ(-o), niyuktaḥ(-ta)),

(d) īśvaraḥ (-ś) cit san(-s) (tu), (pūraṇaḥ(-o'dh-) adhi-kārasya (-ai-) evaṃ) aghaḥ<sup>2</sup> ((-o'st-) asti, yadi kātaye(-a) āradhayitum(-tave) asat(-d)) dhvarate, dveṣiṇe.

*All those Best Blessings are Assigned only to Our Saint ;—  
the Infidel foe has his share without the Fold, and  
with the Evil Mind, his Angra Mainyu.*

5. Tāni ca śvāntena manyunā, (hayé) sumedhaḥ (-o'su-), asura,

(b) taiḥ(-s), tebhīḥ, (prasāda(-ō-)upāyaiḥ(-r)) ṛtāvane (-vani(-ī-), iti) sam-ā(-ā-)acaś,<sup>3</sup> (iti(-y) evaṃ, kila, tāni prasāda-dattāni(-y) ṛtāvane tava niścayena, bahulatvena ca dāsyasi) yāni hi cī\* (?) ca (?), kila, yāni, kāni cit(-c) ca<sup>4</sup> (-ā-) (asan) vahiṣṭhāni ;—

(c) sanutar, kila, bahīḥ(-s), tvadiyāt(-d) joṣāt(-d) dhvaran pāpaḥ(-s) sva-bhagaṃ bhakṣati,

(d) asya cyautnaiḥ(-r) aghāt(-d) manasaḥ(-s), tena manasā saha, vikṛtena tarpaṇena (-ā-), ākṣiyan, manasaḥ ; —(kila, pāpena saha sacan (-n), antar(-s) tasya (-ai-) enaḥsu(-v) \*antaḥ(-s)-sahabhojanaḥ(-o) jīvan (-n) asti, jiviṣyati).

*These Benefits accrue only through His Holy Spirit and  
the Holy Fire—its Sacramental(?) Sign. Armaiti  
is the High Angel of the Practical Devotion in  
Agriculture.*

6. Tāni(-y evaṃ) dhāḥ(-ś) śvāntena, puṇyena, manyunā, (hayé) sumedhaḥ(-o'su-) asura,

<sup>1</sup> Recall -kāti. I think that kātaye, āradhayitum, is here to be understood to make the passage critically intelligible.

<sup>2</sup> Akō can hardly apply directly to the partisan upon the same side as the one referred to in line (c). In this latter case we should have "A man of small means is at the service of the Saint, while even a man of abundant means is 'hostile' to the faithless". What is the sense of that?—It seems to mean that "the cause of the Religion was so appealing that even those who had little means were devoted to it, while those even of ample means were hostile or lukewarm toward the opposition",—but why should these latter be at all regarded as if they could possibly

(c) Even the man of narrow means is at the service of the Saint (who represents us all;—recall *ahmāi*, etc.),

(d) but being one of ample means, (if at the service of the faithless, he is) evil.

5. (a, b) Yea, these things wilt Thou apportion to Our Saint (and Representative), which (comprise) whatsoever things (are) the best;—

(c) but without, outside of, Thy Love<sup>5</sup> the faithless has his portion

(d) through his (evil) deeds abiding in (and finding satisfaction) from the Evil Mind<sup>6</sup>(-ed One).

6. Aye, these things (the best of all that are possible) wilt thou, O Ahura Mazda, give through Thy Fire in the tolerate the thought of the faithless party as objects of sympathy and approval. Why mention that they were “hostile to the faithless”? Of course they were hostile to the faithless if *akō* refers to the Zoroastrian;—there seems to be an absence of force in such a view. Or is it an appeal to aristocratic distinctions? The poor are devoted to our cause and even the rich also are against our enemies;—what business would such an idea have here? Both the humble and the exalted would be naturally upon the side of the “faithful”. Why should not “the exalted” be all the more hostile to the wicked, and on the side of “the faithful”, on account of their abundant means and of their position? It is difficult to see the force of the distinction with *akō* understood as expressing the mental attitude of a true believer. But *aka-* seems to me to be so firmly fixed as an expression referring to the hostile party;—see *acištem manah*, etc., that I think it would hardly be used to characterize the hostility of a Saint toward the faithless;—that is to say, I do not think that *aka-* could be used as, for instance, *mainyēuš . . . draēshanhā* is used in Y. 44, 11, where *dv(a)ēshanha* = “with hate” applies to the Mazda-worshipper, “with my spirit’s hate.”

<sup>3</sup> *Cviš*. For *cviš(-š)*;—cf. *acais* to *ci*, and *nais* to *nē*, with loss of the sign of the 2nd singular. The root-idea seems to be “furnish with”,—lit. “to heap together upon one with (benefits)” ;—but I feel here also a sense of discrimination to be present in the word. I explain the vowels *ōi* in *chōiš* as equalling *a + i* as the equivalent of *ē*. The word is *cēš* for *caiš* = Ind. *cais*.

<sup>4</sup> *cicā*, a nom. pl. neut. to a *ci*-.

<sup>5</sup> Notice the difficulty in rendering *j(a)oshāt* as merely equalling “will” here,—and if not here, then where elsewhere. “Benevolent will” is plainly indicated;—it provides the “happy portion” which the evil cannot share.

<sup>6</sup> This Evil Mind was the contradictory opposite of *Vohu Manah*.

(b) (tāva (-ā-)) atharyā(-ā-),<sup>1</sup> atryā(?), vasau (-uni) vidathe<sup>2</sup> (vidhāne vā madhye) raṇa-krdbhyām (ubhābyām pakṣābhyām etāvat parasparam vivādibhyām, prati - yudyadbhyām)<sup>3</sup>

(c) aramateḥ (-r)\*\* baiḥasā(?)<sup>4</sup> (-ar-) ṛtasyaca (-ā-), asmākaṁ dharmasya puṇyasya;—

(d) sā h'ī \*pūrūns(?), martyān,<sup>5</sup> tāṁ svayam anu(-v) iṣataḥ<sup>6</sup>(?), tat-samīpaṁ gacchataḥ prajñam icchataḥ, svadharmadhyānaṁ vovūrte(?), varayate,<sup>7</sup> (kila, tathā kṛnoti yathā ((-e) iti)) (-ā-) asma-dharmaṁ ati-puṇyaṁ hṛdaya-bhaktayaḥ(-o manasā) upagrhnān).

<sup>1</sup> *Āthrā*. I fully agree with Grassmann in the matter of *athari*; see also an Ind. *athar* as the basis of *athar-van*. Whether the root-idea of the word is "the devouring" ought to be a question.

<sup>2</sup> *Vidaite*. Cf. *vidātha*. Possibly in its sense of "assembly".\* Or again, possibly as a 3rd sg. = "he—the Spirit—distributes", but I no longer prefer this last at present.

<sup>3</sup> Always possibly, but not probably *aranibhyām* (-*nibhyām*).

<sup>4</sup> Formed to *baiḥ*-, as *manaḥ* to *man*-, etc., etc.

<sup>5</sup> *Pourū(n)ś* possibly to Ind. *puru*- = "man", otherwise = "many".

good and just disposal (and in Thine assembly (?)) in regard to the two contending sides (or "through Thy Fire kindled from the two *arani*, kindling sticks" (?))

(c) through the augmentation of success caused by both Aramaiti (Our tiller's sacred Zeal) and by Asha (obedience to the Holy Law when fully, beyond risk, established)

(d) for she, Our Aramaiti, will cause the many men<sup>6</sup> who come (Y. 30, 1) seeking (her) to believe<sup>7</sup> (Our holy creed).

<sup>6</sup> See *isheñtō*, Y. 30, 1; and *ishathā*, Y. 45, 1. See Y. 31, 1. The usage seems to be characteristic, expressing the enthusiastic zeal with which the tribes assembled at some especially sacred festival. I cite the first *iṣ-* plus *anu* to make sure of covering the composer's idea—but the second *iṣ-*, "to wish for," is very suitable. Did the Avesta language distinguish so clearly between the two?—they were, of course, of identical origin.

<sup>7</sup> *Vaurāite* = *vararāite* (intens.);—it must have causative force. I imitate as above. Notice the emphatic presence of Armaiti in this XLVII;—It was agriculture which saved the tribes from barbarism then,—and we see the same Armaiti in the same character, as the one saving force to-day.—Food is now the prime necessity.



### III

## THE SOCIETY OF BIBLICAL ARCHÆOLOGY

By F. LEGGE

THE Society of Biblical Archæology was born at a meeting held on November 18, 1870, at the rooms of Mr. Joseph Bonomi, Curator of the Soane Museum in Lincoln's Inn Fields. Its ruling spirit was from the first Dr. Samuel Birch, the then Keeper of the Assyrian and Egyptian Antiquities at the British Museum, at whose instance the meeting was convened. It was attended by some eighteen gentlemen, of whom Sir Henry Rawlinson, Mr. Fox Talbot, Mr. J. W. Bosanquet, and Canon Cook were perhaps those best known to fame,<sup>1</sup> and in the result decided to form itself into a Society "for the investigation of the Archæology, Chronology, Geography, and History of Ancient and Modern Assyria, Arabia, Egypt, Palestine, and other Biblical Lands, the promotion of the study of the Antiquities of those countries, and the preservation of a continuous record of discoveries now or hereafter to be in progress". With this view an association with Mr. William Cooper as Secretary was instituted, which by March 21 in the following year had received a sufficient number of adherents to hold monthly meetings, at which papers were read, to be afterwards printed and circulated either at the author's expense, or at that of one or two of the richer members. In his Inaugural Address

<sup>1</sup> Several of these gentlemen were the surviving members of four Societies called respectively the Syro-Egyptian Society, the Anglo-Biblical Institute, the Chronological Institute, and the Palestine Archæological Association. These had ceased to meet at the time of the foundation of the Society of Biblical Archæology, and only the first-named possessed any funds. These, amounting with accrued dividend to £64 odd, were transferred to the new Society in 1878. (See *P.S.B.A.*, 1879, p. 4.)



to the first of these gatherings, Dr. Birch, who had been unanimously elected President, gave a summary, still well worth reading, on the then state of Oriental Archæology and the discovery of its principal monuments, and struck the note which has been sustained throughout the Society's history by the announcement that "Archæology and not Theology" was its aim, and that "it must be attractive to all who are interested in the primitive and early history of mankind". Early in 1872 it had progressed sufficiently to take rooms at 9 Conduit Street, Regent Street, to formulate a set of Rules, afterwards embodied in the Memorandum and Articles of Association, and to publish the first volume of *Transactions*, together with a list of 166 members, which included Mr. Tyssen Amherst (afterwards Lord Amherst of Hackney), Mr. Arthur Cates (of H.M. Office of Works), Canon T. K. Cheyne, Dr. Currey (Master of the Charterhouse), Mr. Gladstone, Count Gleichen, Mr. (afterwards Sir) Henry Howorth, Canon Lightfoot, Professor Mahaffy, Mr. Walter Morrison, Canon George Rawlinson, Professor Sayce, and Captain (afterwards Sir Charles) Wilson, R.E.—names which show how widely the net had been thrown. Of the papers published, many were of high merit, and included a study of the Early History of Babylonia by the late George Smith, another on the Origin of Semitic Civilization by Professor Sayce, and several on the then newly-found Cypriote Inscriptions, by their discoverer, Mr. R. Hamilton Lang (H.M. Consul at Cyprus), George Smith, and Dr. Birch.

The events that followed the Terrible Year in France gave a great impetus to the studies which the infant Society had been formed to promote, and the holding of the First Orientalist Congress in Paris in September, 1873, to which it sent delegates, diffused the knowledge of it among the different Universities and Learned Societies of Europe. Consequently the year

1875 saw the numbers of its members rise to 327, while it received the adhesion of such distinguished foreign scholars as Heinrich Brugsch, François Chabas, August Eisenlohr, François Lenormant, Gaston Maspero, Joachim Menant, and Jules Oppert, all of whom became frequent contributors to its *Transactions* and *Proceedings*. About the same time many English scholars joined the Society, including Sir George Birdwood, Father Bowden (of the Oratory), Canon Dalton, Professor Donaldson (its first Foreign Secretary), Sir Harding Giffard (now Lord Halsbury), Cardinal Manning, Sir Charles Nicholson, Mr. (afterwards Sir Peter) Renouf, and Professor William Wright. During this period also Mr. George Smith communicated to the Society the detailed account of his excavations for the *Daily Telegraph* on the site of Nineveh, Mr. Bosanquet many studies of the Synchronous History of Assyria and Babylonia, and Mr. Goodwin the Tale of the Predestined Prince and other Egyptian studies of wide interest, all of which were duly published by the Society. It was a little later than this that the Society formed classes at Islington and elsewhere for the study of Cuneiform and Egyptian hieroglyphs, which gave many students whom business or other circumstances prevented from taking the usual University course their first insight into Oriental Archæology. The Society also began the formation of a library, all the books in which, some of them of great interest, were presented to it by the generosity of certain of its members.

So far the Society had proceeded with a fair wind, but now death began to make gaps in its ranks. The classes, which had been interrupted for some months during the illness of the Secretary, were resumed in 1876 at the Society's new offices, 33 Bloomsbury Street, Professor Sayce, its Foreign Secretary, taking the Assyrian, and Mr. Renouf the Egyptian, while Dr. Birch gave a series of

readings in the *Book of the Dead*. The same year saw the election of Mr. Pinches, Mr. Rylands, the Marquess of Bute, and many others, and the publication of many papers of historical interest on the Chaldean Genesis, the Hittite inscriptions, and two on the Himyaritic and Sabæan languages by Lieut.-Colonel Prideaux, then H.M. Consul at Aden, and always a good friend of the Society. But George Smith's excavations in the East were brought to an end by his premature death, and the following year the Society had to mourn the loss of two of its most prominent members in Mr. Fox Talbot and its Treasurer, Mr. Bosanquet, who had borne hitherto a great part of the cost of the *Transactions*, and this was speedily followed by the demise of its founder, Mr. Bonomi. Hence, it was a relief to everyone when Mr. Arthur Cates, who had voluntarily filled the secretaryship during Mr. Cooper's illness, announced at the meeting of April 2, 1878, that Mr. W. H. Rylands had consented to become its Secretary, a post which he occupied until his regretted retirement in 1901, giving regular attendance at the office and library on three days in the week. The Society at once answered to the stimulus, and the members increased in a few years from 400 to more than 600, while the elections included those of the Rev. C. J. Ball (now Lecturer in Assyriology at Oxford), Mr. (afterwards Sir Walter) Besant, Lord Francis Conyngham, M.P., Mr. (afterwards Sir Charles) Lyall, and Professor Russell Martineau.<sup>1</sup> The new Secretary also began the issue of the monthly *Proceedings*, which in a great measure superseded the *Transactions*, although these last continued to appear at irregular intervals until the issue of the tenth and last volume in 1903. In 1881 the Society removed to more commodious offices in Hart Street,

<sup>1</sup> In 1878 there appears for the first time in the List of Members the name of "Lieut. Kitchener, R.E."—the future Lord Kitchener of Khartoum.

Bloomsbury, where it remained until its final removal to Great Russell Street. It would take too much space to give in detail a list of the valuable papers contributed to its *Proceedings* and *Transactions* during this period, but attention may, perhaps, be drawn here to those of Mr. St. Chad Boscawen, Mr. Wallis Budge, and Mr. Renouf among the native members, and of M. Maspero, M. Naville, M. Eugène Revillout, and Professor Wiedemann among the foreign, while Dr. Birch continued to write for the Society until his death in 1885, when, after a short interregnum, ably filled by Mr. Walter Morrison, he was succeeded by Mr. Peter Renouf. The Society, during this period, also published by subscription the inscriptions from the Bronze Gates of Balawat, and made itself responsible for the accuracy of the translations in the useful series of little books called *Records of the Past*, which has given so many of the general public their first insight into Assyrian and Egyptian literature.

From this time onward the Society prospered under the wise conduct of Sir Peter Renouf and Mr. Rylands until the death of the first-named in 1897. Always closely connected with the British Museum through its successive Presidents, it had remained in close touch with all the principal English and foreign scholars who interested themselves in the archæology of the East, and while Dr. W. Max Müller contributed several papers to its publications, M. Ernest Renan spoke at one of its meetings during a flying visit to England. The discovery of the Tel el-Amarna letters, duly communicated to the Society, gave a new impetus to Egyptology, and one of the salient features of the *Proceedings* at this period is the many papers on Coptic MSS. given by Dr. Wallis Budge, M. Amelineau, M. Revillout, and others. Nor was the study of Jewish antiquities neglected. Frequent papers on this subject by Dr. A. Löwy, a very early member of the Society, Dr. S. Louis, and Dr. Gaster also appeared in

the *Proceedings*, and were of sufficient general interest to attract the attention even of those who were not archæologists; and the same may be said of the many contributions of Professor Sayce and others upon the less known languages of the East, such as the Hittite, Syrian, and Carian. As the Rev. C. J. Ball, during the same period, anticipated the later opinion of many Orientalists of the present day, in a valuable series of studies drawing attention to the likeness between the earliest known language, called at that time indifferently Akkadian and Sumerian, on the one hand and Chinese on the other, it may be said that no part of the East except India had hitherto escaped the Society's attention.

Sir Peter Renouf's death in 1896 put an end for some time to the close connexion that had till then existed between the Society and the British Museum. His place was filled after a short interval, bridged as before by the kind offices of Mr. Walter Morrison, by the election of Professor Sayce, who had been replaced as Foreign Secretary some seven years earlier by the Rev. Robert Gwynne. The Society had removed in 1891, as has been said, to 37 Great Russell Street, immediately opposite the British Museum, and had registered under the Companies Acts for the purpose of taking a long lease of its new premises. From this advantageous position it was comparatively easy for Sir Peter Renouf, Keeper like his predecessor, Dr. Birch, of the Assyrian and Egyptian Antiquities at the National Institution, to keep a watchful eye on the Society's activities, to procure contributions to its *Proceedings* from the foreign scholars who came daily to visit him, and to keep up the flow of new recruits to fill up the gaps in its ranks caused by death. Yet, in spite of all exertions, the roll did not at the time of his death exceed 400, and it says much for Professor Sayce's energy that neither his residence in Oxford nor his constant visits to the East prevented this number from

being sustained for another decade. He became, if possible, a more indefatigable contributor to its *Proceedings* than before, and papers on his favourite subject of the Hittites, on Lydian History, and on the many excavations seen by him during his yearly visits to Egypt poured from his pen in profusion.

Sir Peter Renouf's English version of the *Book of the Dead*, which was running through the *Proceedings* at his death and was afterwards published separately, was taken up and completed by M. Edouard Naville, of Geneva, always a staunch friend and supporter of the Society, and the removal by lapse of time of the many foreign scholars who had seen the Society's birth was compensated in some measure by the adhesion of such American scholars as Professor Breasted and of the band of younger Egyptologists, including Professor Newberry, Mr. Weigall, and Mr. Crum, who had grown up round the excavations of the Egypt Exploration Fund. Nor were students in other branches of learning wanting. The Rev. C. H. W. Johns, now Master of St. Catharine's College, Cambridge, Dr. Gaster, Sir Henry Howorth, and Professor Torrey all joined in with contributions to more strictly Biblical subjects, while Mr. Pilcher began the study of charms and periapts mainly connected with the Jewish Cabala which he continued up to the last days of the Society. But almost the last link with the past was snapped in 1902, when Mr. Rylands retired from the Secretaryship which he had filled for nearly a quarter of a century. He had nursed the Society, if not from its birth, yet from its earliest infancy, and had seen it grow from a very small group of scholars into a Society known to the learned world in three continents; and his tact and kindliness had done much to keep it free from those bickerings and dissensions which have proved fatal to many Associations of the same kind. Last, but not least, his ready pencil had always been at the disposal of all

who wished to illustrate their papers by cuts, diagrams, or maps, and his thorough knowledge of the technical processes of reproduction had made the *Proceedings* famous for the care and finish of their outward appearance.

His place was in many respects worthily filled by the appointment of Dr. Nash. Mr. Walter Nash was, like Mr. Rylands, a Fellow of the Society of Antiquaries, in the management of which he had lately taken part, and in his capacity as a medical man he had travelled much in the East, where he had proved himself a most diligent collector of antiquities. Hence he brought to the Society an expert knowledge of the smaller and more portable monuments which was of the greatest use to it. Above all, he had made himself a past master in the art of photography, by no means as common or as perfect sixteen years ago as it is to-day, and his skill in this respect and in the preparation of lantern-slides caused the papers and *Proceedings* to be illustrated with a richness and a fulness that improved even on the efforts of his predecessor. He followed, too, the example generously set by Mr. Rylands in refusing after two or three years to accept the salary allotted to the post, and he introduced a rigid economy into the Society's methods which is largely responsible for the fact that to the last it remained not only free from debt but was able to keep its yearly expenditure well within its income. Shortly after his appointment, the tie between the Society and the Museum was renewed by the election of Dr. Leonard King, Mr. H. R. Hall, Mr. Campbell Thompson, and Mr. Scott-Moncrieff, all of them of the Assyrian and Egyptian Department, and they were from that time frequent contributors to its *Proceedings*. Such ripe and finished scholars as Professor Burkitt and Dr. Langdon also contributed freely to the Society's publications, and among other notable papers about this time were those by Mr. A. J. Butler on the identity of the "Mukawkis"

who is supposed to have betrayed Christian Egypt under Heraclius to the Mahommedans, the profusely illustrated description of scarabs belonging to Mr. John Ward and to Mr. Willoughby Fraser, and an inquiry into the best mode of transliterating Egyptian, which produced replies from nearly every Egyptian scholar in Europe. Mr. Hall also gave to the Society the good news of the discovery by Professor Naville of the Eleventh Dynasty temple at Deir-el-Bahari, at which he had worked with the late Mr. Ayrton. All these papers owed much to their illustrations, and it was largely due to Dr. Nash's unwearying patience in photographing and making slides that the present writer was able to work out a hint of Sir Gaston Maspero and to collect and publish a more or less complete series of the carved slates which form the earliest pictorial records of Egypt and perhaps of civilization itself, of the ivory wands used for magical purposes under the Middle Empire, and of other similar objects which have been since made use of by many English and foreign writers on Egyptology.<sup>1</sup>

Thus the Society continued for several years without any apparent sign of decay or falling off in its activities. The number of subscribers remained up to 1914 at about 400, and the finances of the Society were made even more secure than before by legacies from two of its earliest members,<sup>2</sup> and by the ready help afforded in every emergency by Mr. Walter Morrison. Yet gradually it became more and more difficult to find suitable candidates for election, and the number of those attending the monthly meetings began to fall off. This was no doubt

<sup>1</sup> The papers here mentioned received for the most part special mention in the Council's annual reports. For others at least equally good the reader is referred to the excellent indexes to the *Transactions* and to vols. i-xx and xxi-xxx of the *Proceedings* respectively. It is much to be hoped that the series may be fitly closed by an index to vols. xxx-xl, prepared like the others by Dr. Nash.

<sup>2</sup> The Rev. Charles Marshall and Mr. F. D. Mocatta.



due in part to the fact that the age of sensational discoveries seemed past, and that the great advance made in scientific and systematic excavation generally inclined the excavator to reserve the account of what he had discovered for more elaborate and detailed description than could be given in a semi-popular lecture lasting not longer than an hour. Another reason was doubtless to be found in the far greater number of periodicals dealing with such matters then appearing than was the case when the Society was founded. Thus, to take only two instances, Professor Garstang's discovery of the Sun-temple at Meroë was first described in the *Annals of Archaeology* published by the University of Liverpool, and Professor Naville's finding of the Pool of Osiris at Abydos in the *Journal of Egyptian Archaeology* published by the Egypt Exploration Fund, neither of which publications was in existence a few years earlier. Yet perhaps the greatest cause of this lack of interest in the meetings was the advance of archæology itself towards the dignity of a science, which forced upon the writers of papers an attention to philological and other details which were not calculated, when read aloud, to arrest and hold the attention of a general audience. Certain it is that when, for instance, the President returned from the East, brimful of the work he had seen in Asia, Egypt, or Nubia, or when Mr. (now Captain) Campbell Thompson lectured to the Society upon the folklore that he had collected while attending the British Museum's excavations at Nineveh or Jerablus, they had no reason to complain of lack of an audience.

Thus matters stood when the War broke out, which transformed most of our institutions. Before it had lasted many weeks, the Secretary received notice of more than 100 withdrawals, which reduced its already attenuated membership by a fourth. Many of these withdrawals came from enemy countries, nearly all the

University and other public libraries in North Germany and Austria having been constant subscribers to its *Proceedings* from the start, while the older type of German Professor had shown himself in many cases a true friend to the Society, to which some of them had belonged almost since its birth. Others were from English members who had, as has been said, gradually ceased to take an active interest in its operations, and were therefore only waiting for an opportunity to reduce their list of subscriptions. Even then it was hoped that the Society might continue to carry on, although with maimed rites, until the War, which many of us confidently expected would be short if sharp, was over. But as the struggle proceeded blow after blow fell upon it. First, every one of the younger members, and many even of those who were no longer young, were in turn called away either to military service or to some form of war work which left them little time to devote to the study of antiquity. Then the Egypt Exploration Fund, who had taken part of its house in Great Russell Street off its hands ever since its incorporation, and had thereby relieved it of the greater part of its liability for the rent, signified their wish to discontinue the tenancy. Finally, the health of Dr. Nash, who had kept the Society together since Mr. Rylands' retirement in 1902, gave way altogether, and his colleagues were confronted with the task of finding new tenants for two-thirds of the house and a new volunteer Secretary for a Society which had already lost, either permanently or temporarily, the greater part of its more active members.

What followed is probably already known to most, if not all, who read this. During Dr. Birch's Presidency, the Society of Biblical Archæology had received overtures for amalgamation from the Royal Asiatic Society, of which Sir Henry Rawlinson was then the presiding genius; but the negotiations failed through Sir Henry's not seeing

always eye to eye with the authorities of the British Museum, where he was then working on the *Cuneiform Inscriptions of Western Asia*. Later, when Mr. Rylands first thought of retiring from the Secretaryship, a deputation consisting of Professor Sayce, Mr. Rylands, and the writer, who had succeeded Mr. Gwynne as Hon. Foreign Secretary in 1901, waited upon the Royal Asiatic Society to see whether the negotiations thus broken off could not be renewed. The matter again fell through, mainly from the view taken by the Council of the Royal Asiatic Society that the affair was not urgent. The third attempt was more successful, and the amalgamation desired was carried out on the terms of which every member of both Societies has been informed. Luckily the generosity of past members of the Society of Biblical Archæology and the strict and rigid economy practised by its successive Secretaries had enabled them to accumulate a small reserve fund against contingencies, which, with the proceeds of the sale of its lease, furniture, and the obsolete parts of its library, have enabled it to transfer to the Asiatic Society a handsome sum which should help to repair the damage that the War has caused to its finances; and most of the members remaining in the Society of Biblical Archæology after the four terrible years of the War have since come over to Albemarle Street. Let us hope that here they will be able not only to preserve the memory, but to continue the activities which have distinguished the work of the defunct Society for a period of nearly half a century.<sup>1</sup>

<sup>1</sup> Among other good works of the Society may be specially mentioned the fount of Hittite characters drawn by Mr. Rylands, and the new Coptic types introduced by it.

---

#### IV

### FOUR ASSYRIOLOGICAL NOTES

By S. LANGDON

#### 1. THE IDENTIFICATION OF THE NAME *D.TAGTUG*

SUMERO-BABYLONIAN myths and legends were rich in tales of prehistoric rulers, heroes who became the subjects of epics, poems, and cults. Consecutive and intensive study of Cuneiform inscriptions has revealed a vast structure of ancient Sumerian hero-worship upon which was erected their extensive theological and ethical literature. Of the kings of the first legendary dynasty at Kish, Etana, a one-time shepherd, became the hero of a fine poem, preserved only in Semitic, known as The Legend of Etana, him who essayed to mount to heaven on the wings of an eagle in quest of the "plant of child-bearing". Dumuzi, the hunter, king in a legendary dynasty of Erech, was deified and became the dying god of Sumerian religion. Gilgamesh, a king of the same dynasty, became the national hero of Sumer and Akkad, about whom arose endless stories of the chase and the epic of "He that hath seen all things", or the so-called Epic of Gilgamesh. Ziusuddu, last of the ten legendary kings before the flood, became the famous survivor of the Flood in both Sumerian and Accadian poems of the Deluge. About Adapa, a seafaring sage of Eridu, was told one of the versions of the fall of man.

All of these old culture names have long been known in our Assyriological studies and have, in fact, become permanent possessions of general mythology. The discovery of another name of this stalwart class of literary and mythical figures was, in fact, unexpected by any Assyriologist; for we had supposed that our extensive knowledge of Sumerian, Babylonian, and Assyrian literature at least placed in our hands the major legends

of their religion and, more or less completely, the most important of their literary productions. Certainly we could not surmise that a great culture hero who figured in Sumerian poetry and in Assyrian grammatical texts as a deified man, risen from the humble rank of a weaver and fuller, remained unknown to us.

In 1915 the writer published the large six-column Sumerian tablet of Nippur, in which a hitherto unknown figure came upon the scene of legend and poetry.<sup>1</sup> Here in the first column of the reverse appeared one *Tag-tug*, a deified man, in this poem a gardener, with whom Enki, the god of wisdom and mysteries, converses and prescribes to him which plants he may eat from in the garden. The writer saw in this deified *Tag-tug* the man who, according to Sumerian tradition, brought upon mankind the loss of eternal life. In 1916 the writer found, on a tablet in Philadelphia, another legend in Sumerian from the same collection, this same *dingir Tag-tug*, the deified *Tag-tug*, referred to as the founder of civilization, personification of beneficent rulership.<sup>2</sup> The writer even then did not realize the important place which this new demi-god held in Babylonian religion. But in the *Revue d'Assyriologie*, vol. xv, 193-4 (1918), Professor Scheil, of the Académie Française, published an extract from a late Babylonian grammatical text in which this name *dingir Tag-tug* is explained.<sup>3</sup> Now it is obvious that a name of this kind which figures in a grammatical text must have been one of utmost importance. Grammatical texts admit explanations of the names of Gilgamish and Ziudsuddu also. Scheil's discovery then led me to recall a similar grammatical text of the British Museum which had been unexplained and which turns out to be a long comment









<sup>1</sup> The *Sumerian Epic of Paradise, the Flood, and the Fall of Man*, Philadelphia, 1915. French edition and revised text in press.

<sup>2</sup> See the *Expository Times*, February, 1918, pp. 218-21.

<sup>3</sup> The discovery was communicated to me privately in July, 1918, by Père Scheil.

on this name. I therefore discuss the Paris and the London tablets in that order here.



The Scheil tablet has the following entries:—

1. *tu-ku* :  : *ma-ḥa-ṣu ṣa*  (i.e. *ṣubāti*)
2.  :  : *pu-zu(?)-ū ṣa* <sup>isu</sup>*NAD* (i.e. *irši*)
3. *ut-tu* :   :  

These signs are written in the cursive Babylonian script which I have transcribed into ordinary Assyrian characters.

The Sumerian word *tag*, which is explained in the second column of lines 1 and 2 above, means *maḥāṣu ṣa ṣubāti*, to beat clothing, to full, to laundry, and *puzū ṣa iṣuṛši* to whiten or clean a bed. The word *tag* has here the dialectic pronunciation *tuku*. The classical pronunciation was probably *tag*, and the name of our hero was *Tag-tug*, the fuller, the laundryman, "the beater of clothing." His name was also pronounced *Tuku-tug*, or *Tuk-tug*. My original transcription of this name was therefore correct. In the Assyrian language *māḥiṣu* is a word for fuller, and we can only conclude with Scheil that *Tag-tug*, like so many other culture heroes, rose from one of the humble walks of life.

Now, before we discuss the all-important statement in line 3 above, I shall call attention to a broken passage in a grammatical text of the British Museum published by Mr. R. Campbell Thompson.<sup>1</sup> This passage is to be restored after the Paris tablet as follows:—

[. . .   : *ṣa*] *tu-kul-la šuridakku igub* : [. . .]

We have here the sign *tug* written within the sign *tag* instead of after it, a well-known method of writing two signs which occur constantly in combination. The scribe explains this new compound in the usual way: "Sign where *tukul* (i.e. *tug*) has been placed in *šuridu* (i.e. *tag*)."

<sup>1</sup> *Cuneiform Texts from Babylonian Tablets in the British Museum*, vol. xii, pl. 24a, 65.

This new compound *TAG + TUG* has of course the same meaning as *tag-tug*, to full, to laundry clothes. Line 3 of the citation from the Scheil tablet says that *TAG + TUG*, when employed in the name *dingir TAG + TUG*, was pronounced *uttu*.

We are thus enabled to explain another grammatical text of the Neo-Babylonian period, also from the British Museum.<sup>1</sup> Here we have the following explanation of the name *a.Tag-tug*:—

1. (*ut-tu*) *TAG + TUG* : *a.TAG + TUG*
2. (*uttu*) *a.Zadim* : 𐎶
3. (*uttu*) *a.RAT* : 𐎶
4. (*uttu*) *a.Kišib* : 𐎶
5. (*uttu*) *a.Sá-bar* : 𐎶
6. (*uttu*) *a.Uš-bar* : 𐎶
7. (*uttu*) *ŠIT* : *mi-nu-tum*

In this list the name *a.Tag-tug* has, in lines 1–6, six explanations.

Line 1 agrees with the Paris text, telling us that this name was pronounced *Uttu*. Line 2 identifies him as a jeweller, or silversmith; the *zadim*, or silversmith, became a hero and was deified. Line 3 identifies him with the fuller; *RAT(zu-šu)* = *kašāru*, to scrub, laundry, C.T. 12, 18, 39. The ordinary word for fuller is *kāširu*. Line 4 identifies him with the *dupšar* or scribe, “the god of the seal.” Line 5 identifies him with the *sá-bar*, that is probably *ša purussī*, he of wisdom, the judge, counsellor.<sup>2</sup>

Line 6 identifies him with the *ušparu* or weaver.

\* Line 7 is more difficult to explain. Here the sign *ŠIT* = *minūtum*, number. When this sign has the meaning “number” it has the value *šiti*, *šit*, to count, but it seems

<sup>1</sup> Rm. 2, 588, rev. col. ii, last section, published by Meissner, *Supplement zu den Assyrischen Wörterbüchern*, pl. 25. A much better copy of this important section is given by T. J. Meek, *American Journal of Semitic Languages*, vol. xxxi, 287.

<sup>2</sup> The same title is applied to Enlil and explained by *ša purussī*, C.T. 24, 39, 5.

to have been read *uttu*. The tablet is broken away here, but *ut-tu* almost certainly stood as a gloss at the beginning of line 7.

The main fact to be disengaged from this syllabary is that *Tag-tug* the fuller was also regarded as a jeweller, a laundryman, a scribe, a wise man, and a weaver. The epithets in lines 3 and 6 agree with the original meaning of *tag-tug*, or *tuku-tug*, i.e. "beater of clothing", fuller. But whatever his epithet, whether as jeweller, scribe, weaver, etc., he is always called *Uttu*. Obviously *uttu* cannot mean fuller, jeweller, scribe, judge, and weaver. This name must have been given to *Tag-tug* in all his aspects for some extraneous reason which had no relation to philology. The only explanation that appears possible to the writer is that this hero was identified with the famous *Uta-napištim*, Semitic translation of *Zi-ud* < *Zi-ud-sud-du*, the survivor of the Flood. The Semitic form of this name was originally *Uta-napištim-arik*, long is the breath of life. This was probably abbreviated to *Uta* and then inflected in the nominative *Uttu*. The same process of abbreviation is seen in the name <sup>a</sup>*Gi(s)-bil-ga-miš*, which appears in early versions of the Epic of Gilgamesh as <sup>a</sup>*Giš*, simply.

## 2. *APSASŪ*, A KIND OF WILD CATTLE

Delitzsch, in the fifth edition of his *Assyrische Lesestücke*, p. 30, gave two lexicographical entries which were new, and no reference accompanies the statement. The entries are: *áb-za-za* = *apsasū* and *sal áb-za-za* = *apsasūtu*. Since the first element of this Sumerian word *áb* means "wild ox", we have at least some indication of its meaning. The loan-word *apsasū* occurs also in C.T. 22, 48, 6 in the list of animals *šabītum* kid, *apsasū*, *nimru* panther. For another list, cf. *Babyloniaca*, ii, pl. ii, 31-3, *immeru* lamb, *áb-za-za*, *aribu* raven. A king is addressed as *áb-za-za*, *Historical*



and *Religious Texts*, p. 25, 6, hence an animal noted for its strength and beauty. The female of this animal appears apparently as a domestic animal in a text of the Sargonic period, Barton, *Sumerian Business Documents*, No. 21, *ab-za-za-tim*, a loan-word which came into Semitic before the *nisbeh* ending *ai* was added to this class of words in Semitic.

### 3. *IR* = *ZUTU*, SWEAT

Holma, in *Orientalische Literatur Zeitung*, 1911, 385, by restoring C.T. 11, 24, 25 from B.M. 93070 (C.T. 12, 32) obtained the result *i-ri : IR : zu-'-tum*. The augmented form *ir-ta = zu'tu* was known. That this restoration was correct is proven by Scheil's new medical text, *Revue d'Assyriologie*, xiv, 121, and passages cited by that scholar on p. 130. Scheil translated *IR* correctly without identifying the Sumerian *IR* with Semitic *zu'tu*. The passage in his text Obv. 20 *NE ù IR* clearly means *ummu ù zu'tu*, heat and sweat, as *ŠED ù IR* in Boissier, *Documents Assyriens*, 20, 7 means *kussu ù zu'tu*, chill and sweat.

### 4. *ARA* = *NAMĀRU*, BLAZE, SHINE

The ideogram *UD-DU* ordinarily employed for *ašûl*, go forth, by long association with *a-Babbar UD-DU*, going forth of the sun, finally came to mean *namāru ša ummi*, breaking of the day. In this sense *UD-DU* was read *ara*, as we know from C.T. 12, 7a 2, *ara : UD-DU : namru*, bright. In other words a Sumerian root *ara*, shine, be bright, is established. The root occurs also in the form *ar* in an unpublished text, Nippur 8384, 1, *nî-gal ar* blazing in splendour. The gunufied form of *UD-DU*, i.e. *DUL-DU*, has all the meanings of the simple form. Consequently we may assume *ara : DUL-DU : namāru*. This is probably the explanation of the passage in *Revue d'Assyriologie*, xiv, 123 22 *inā-šu DUL-DU-a*, i.e. *namrā*, his eyes shine.

## LABOUR SONGS IN INDIA

By W. COLDSTREAM

A LATE issue of the *Times* contained an article on Labour action songs, giving illustrations. I give below two of the chants which are, or used to be, droned out by the palki-bearers on the Simla-Bilaspur and the Dalhousie-Pathānkot road. The railway and Tonga have now nearly made them a thing of the past. The palki or palanquin is carried by four bearers who shoulder the pole running through the vehicle, two men in front and two behind.

The chants are doggerel couplets in the language of these hills: the first line of the couplet is droned out by the men in front, and the second line, in answer, by those behind.

The drone, or moan (for they get pretty tired and breathless at the end of their 4 miles, though they are well accustomed to the task and go easily) acts as a not unpleasant lullaby to the somnolent traveller on his night journey. The dāk, or succession of relays of the palki-bearers, is "laid" by an avant-courier (*sarbarāh*), in fixed stages of 4 to 6 miles. At each stage there is a dāk chaūdhri, who calls out and keeps ready the required number of bearers.

The first line of each couplet describes the road or obstacles, for the information of the bearers behind (who see nothing with the bulk of the palki in front of them). The second line, or refrain, is either a pious ejaculation, or a curse on the impious, or a prayer for the traveller inside.

- I. *Refrains droned out by the paliki-bearers (Kahárs or Jīnwars) on the Pathānkot and Dalhousie Road, 1887. Taken down from the lips of the paliki-bearers.*

1. Paira chaila.

Pir pahila.

There is mud at your feet.

The Pir (holy Father) is first.

2. Thokar paire.

Naukar mātā de.

There is something in the road to make you trip.

I am servant of the mother (the Goddess Devi).

3. Pair chalta.

Chale sūm<sup>1</sup> ka.

The foot slips.

Let the foot of the impious man slip.

4. Kāti paire.

Sūm ko phānsi.

There is wood (a fallen branch or board) at our feet.

Let the impious man be hanged.

5. Paire loṭon.

Loṭe páji.

There is a rolling stone at our feet.

Let the silly fellow roll over.

6. Ám pháre.

Phũnk parwá ki dhári.

There are split mangoes<sup>2</sup> on the road.

Burn the beard of the parwá.

7. Dhamka pairi.

Dam Dáta·ká.

A place where the foot goes down (a depression).

The Lord (Dáta Ganj Bakhsh is a favourite saint of the Moslems) gives us our breath.

<sup>1</sup> *Sūm* was described to me as the man who gives no alms.

<sup>2</sup> Euphemism for horse-dung.

8. Bháwen Mal.  
Tal.

There is dirt on the left.  
Avoid it.

9. Moti chúr.  
Házir Huzúr.

Big grit or pebbles (very trying to the feet).  
The Lord is present (to help us).

10. Jal nir.  
Dhan Kháwja Pir.

Here is water.  
The grace of Pir Khwája (will help us).

11. Jiwe jore.  
Jug, jug tore.

Let the pair (of bearers) live (i.e. flourish).  
Yea, even for ages.

II. *Song, or drone ("Hungára," from húngna (Panjābi) to moan or mutter) of the palki-bearers on the Simla-Bilaspur Road. Picked up from the lips of the palki-bearers, 1889.*

1. Paūnde jamīn.  
Pawe sūm pápi ka sir.

The ground here goes low, descends.  
Let the head of the impious sinner lie low.

2. Charhe charháí.  
Rákhsha kare Baghbatti mai.

Go up the ascent.  
May Mother Baghbati preserve us.

3. Pheti gad.  
Sūm pápi ki chháti par chhad.

A stone in the way.  
Let it down on the chest of the impious sinner.

4. Moti chúr ghanna.  
Pápi ki chháti ká chúr.

There is lots of rough gravel.  
The gravel of the breast of a sinner.

## 5. Kankar daghádár.

Dáta ka vadde punár.

Treacherous stones.

May the master's family be increased (Dátá="master"  
here, the traveller in the palki).

## 6. Jal bhár.

Dáta ke vadde purár.

Water to cross.

May the master's family be increased.

## 7. Jhamb agássi.

Sūm ke gal phássi.

There is a branch in the way.

May the impious fellow's throat be strangled.

## 8. Chikri chaumássa.

Sat Gúr ki ássa.

There is mud as in the (four months of) the rains.

Trust in the true Gúrú.

## 9. Thokraṇ par pag dhyán.

Naũkar málakán da sabdhán.

Take care of your footsteps, not to trip.

Let the servants of the master be comforted (?).

## 10. Phirri girri ke áná.

Milli gilli ke jána.

Turn round as you come along.

Step all together (used when going round a corner).

---

## THE RETIREMENT OF THE HONORARY LIBRARIAN

Members of the Society will learn with great regret that the Honorary Librarian, O. Codrington, Esq., M.D., F.S.A., has decided to retire from this office, which he has held from the year 1891. The Library is largely consulted, but few can be aware of the nature and extent of the Librarian's work, covering so wide a field of studies and dealing with MSS. and prints in many Oriental languages and scripts. Dr. Codrington has devoted his whole time to the ordering of the Society's ample collections, and in addition to the lists of acquisitions regularly published in the Journal, has arranged for the publication of special catalogues, of which the most extensive is the catalogue of our Sanskrit MSS. by Professor Winternitz, issued in 1902. He himself compiled the catalogue of the Arabic, Persian, and Turkish MSS., and by dint of much research in the archives he succeeded in drawing up a list of the Society's possessions, together with the names of the donors.

It is known also that Dr. Codrington has had a large share in the general affairs of the Society, and on more than one occasion has undertaken the duties of the Secretary for a considerable period. His advice, backed by a special intimacy with the matters coming up for consideration, has always had weight with the Council, while in the dispatch of current business the officers have been supported by his constant presence and direction. During the interregnum of the past year, he also bore for some months the burden of editing the Journal.

Dr. Codrington may carry with him into his well-earned rest the assurance that his services are appreciated by the Society and his help gratefully remembered by those who have worked with him.

F. W. T.

## FONDATION DE GOEJE

*Communication*

1. Le Conseil de la Fondation, n'ayant subi aucun changement depuis le mois de novembre, 1917, est composé comme suit : MM. C. Snouck Hurgronje (président), M. Th. Houtsma, T. J. De Boer, K. Kuiper, et C. Van Vollenhoven (secrétaire-trésorier).

2. Sont encore disponibles un certain nombre d'exemplaires des trois ouvrages publiés par la Fondation. La vente de ces ouvrages se fait chez l'éditeur E. J. Brill à Leyde, au profit de la Fondation : No. 1, Reproduction photographique du manuscrit de Leyde de la *Ḥamāsah d'al-Buḥturî* (1909), au prix de 96 florins hollandais ; No. 2, le *Kitâb el-Fâkhîr d'al-Mufaḍḍal*, publié par C. A. Storey (1915), au prix de 6 florins ; No. 3, *Streitschrift des Gazâlî gegen die Bâtînijja-Sekte*, par I. Goldziher (1916), au prix de 4,50 florins.

3. Le Conseil espère que la publication de l'ouvrage de M. C. Van Arendonk sur les origines de la dynastie Zaidite du Yemen, annoncée depuis deux ans, mais retardée par des circonstances imprévues, aura lieu dans peu de temps.

4. Le Conseil publiera ensuite deux autres ouvrages : "Bar Hebraeus' Book of the Dove, together with some chapters of his *Ethikon*," par M. A. J. Wensinck, et une étude de M. I. Goldziher sur l'histoire de l'interprétation du Qoran (édition augmentée des conférences tenues par l'auteur à Uppsala en 1913).

*Novembre, 1918.*

## NOTICE

The Modern Language Research Association, whose object is to bring about correspondence, collaboration, and mutual help between students of modern languages, will welcome application for membership from students of the living languages of India and the East generally. Application should be made to E. Allison Peers, Esq., The Old School House, Felsted, Essex.

# MISCELLANEOUS COMMUNICATIONS

## THE WORK OF SIR M. AUREL STEIN K.C.I.E. PRINCIPAL PUBLICATIONS NOTICED

### INDIA

1892. *Rājatarāṅginī*, ed. of Sanskrit text.  
1900. *Rājatarāṅginī*, annotated transl., 2 vols., 4to  
(Constable, Westminster).  
1905. *Archaeological Survey Progress Report*.

### CENTRAL ASIA

#### FIRST EXPEDITION

1903. *Sand-buried Ruins of Khotan*, 1 vol., 8vo (Unwin).  
1907. *Ancient Khotan*, 2 vols., 4to (Clarendon Press).  
1908. *Mountain Panoramas*, foolscap fol. (Roy. Geogr.  
Soc.).

#### SECOND EXPEDITION

1912. *Ruins of Desert Cathay*, 2 vols., large 8vo  
(Macmillan).

In preparation, *Serindia*, the scientific account of the  
second expedition.

#### THIRD EXPEDITION

1917. *A Third Journey of Exploration*, etc., in *Ind.  
Ant.*, vol. xlv (1917), June–November inclusive  
(reprinted from Journ. Roy. Geogr. Soc.).

Many years have elapsed since Stein and I first met,  
and ever since that uncertain date we have maintained  
occasional correspondence, sometimes taking the form of  
collaboration in minor matters. My latest letter from  
him, dated June 7, 1918, includes the following passage:—

“I have been hard at work since the winter on completing  
*Serindia*, and the text is now getting near the end. Since  
the end of May I have regained my beloved mountain top,  
11,000 feet above the sea, where I have done most of my big  
writing tasks before. It is delightfully peaceful and cool up



here. I enclose a little photo showing my own ridge. At Śrīnagar, too, I had a good working time, but the winter was long, and, of course, even far away one feels what it means living through a tragic chapter of history. May it end well! . . . Chavannes' death has been a terrible blow to me . . . who among Orientalists could have been less spared than he?"

It is a pleasure to me to comply with the request of our Honorary Secretary and supply for the Journal a summary appreciation of Stein's manifold activities.

Most people find the Indian Institute at Oxford a fairly quiet place, but it was too noisy for Stein, who hurried away from it to bury himself in the wilds of Devonshire in order to work in peace. He is never really happy until he is perched on his "beloved mountain top" in Kashmir, far from the madding crowd and alone with the sublimities of nature. In that atmosphere he is at his best.

Stein is still a comparatively young man, 56 years of age, and if the fates are kind we may expect from him many years more of brilliant research. Even if he should not feel equal to further toilsome exploration in deserts and mountains, the material already collected by him is enough to furnish work for scores of scholars during scores of lives. Stein began his Asiatic studies at an early age, and was only 21 when he became Ph.D. in 1883. During the thirty-five years since that date his labours have been incessant, covering an enormous territorial space and countless centuries of time. He has held several hard-worked official appointments in India, and yet has always been able to find leisure for research. His linguistic equipment in Iranian, Sanskritic, and numerous other tongues is unusually adequate, while he is almost peculiar in combining with the erudition of the armchair scholar all the active qualities and technical knowledge which are indispensable to the successful explorer. A reviewer has summed up the exceptional combination of gifts possessed by Stein in the words:

"In the combination of romantic adventure with scientific precision Dr. Stein is a worthy successor to his famous countrymen, Csoma Cörösi, Leitner, and Vambéry. He has the advantage over them, no doubt, in philological training. The Government of India is fortunate in commanding the services of so eminent a master in the modern profession of archæological *cum* geographical exploration." His interest in geographical science, fitly honoured by the Royal Geographical Society, is as keen as his *flair* for unearthing the relics of the forgotten past from the rubbish heaps of Chinese Turkestan. His researches have added immensely to the world's store of knowledge concerning the geography of the almost inaccessible regions of the Pāmīrs and the mountain ranges and other features of the country to the north of the Himālaya. The details of his geographical discoveries lie outside the circle of my special studies, and I shall not attempt to appraise their exact value, which is highly appreciated by expert judges. A little-known work of his published by the Royal Geographical Society in 1908 may be mentioned. It is a foolscap folio volume entitled *Mountain Panoramas from the Pāmīrs and Kwen Lun*, photographed and annotated by M. A. Stein. The Kwen Lun is the range of mountains to the south of Khotan. The panoramic views, taken from a great distance with the aid of special instruments, are not only beautiful and interesting, but precious to the scientific geographer.

With such inadequate recognition of Stein's achievements as a geographer and surveyor, I pass to fields more within the range of my knowledge and studies.

#### INDIA

One of my most treasured possessions is a presentation copy of the annotated version of the *Rājataranginī* of Kalhaṇa, the historian of Kashmīr, who wrote in the

twelfth century. Stein's monumental translation, published in two massive volumes in 1900, had been preceded in 1892 by a critical edition of the text based on the *codex archetypus* secured in 1889. That edition is, I understand, all that such a work ought to be. Much personal use entitles me to speak with authority of the excellence of the annotated translation, with its supplementary essays. The book is an encyclopædia of Kashmīr lore. Although the political history of the valley and surrounding territories had little influence upon the course of general Indian history, the cultural results of the forms of civilization developed in Kashmīr have been immense. They might, indeed, form the subject of a large volume.

An interesting and well-illustrated *Archæological Survey Progress Report* for 1904-5, recording the results of a tour in the N.W. Frontier Province, includes a survey of the Mahāban mountain, long supposed to be the Aornos so prominently mentioned in the accounts of Alexander's campaign in the hills. Stein's investigations proved conclusively that Mahāban cannot possibly be Aornos. All other attempts at identification having broken down previously, the position of Aornos remains unknown. Stein was rather inclined to regard the Greek story of the siege as a romance, although he admits the possibility of discovering the 'true position higher up the Indus, where Sir Bindon Blood would place it, perhaps near Baio, which is beyond the sharp bend above Kotkai. A bend adjoining the place is required because the Indus washed the *southern* face of the stronghold. I cannot accept the suggestion that the Greek story may be a romantic invention; but, unfortunately, our relations with the local tribes are such that the solution of the problem is likely to be long deferred.

#### CENTRAL ASIA

I now pass from India to Stein's famous expeditions into Central Asia. The compilation of my notes has been

rendered easier by the help of a collection of reviews and newspaper cuttings kindly supplied by Mrs. Hoernle. I may take this opportunity of recording my deep personal regret at the loss of Dr. Hoernle, who died on November 12, 1918. He devoted ungrudging labour to the elucidation of the Stein collections. His death, following that of Chavannes, seriously interferes with the working up of the huge mass of material gathered by Stein.

*First Expedition to Chinese Turkestan, 1900-1.*—In 1897 the idea of archaeological work about Khotan was suggested by examination or consideration of various manuscripts and other curious odds and ends which had been brought in from that region by treasure-seekers and sold to European collectors. With the help of Lord Curzon, then Governor-General of India, and other influential persons, the plan of an expedition was worked out during 1898 and 1899, the requisite funds on an economical but sufficient scale being provided. The explorer reached Khotan on October 10, 1900, and spent about seven months in the territory. He returned to London via the Trans-Caspian Railway, receiving much kind help from the Russian authorities, and bringing with him twelve great cases full of manuscripts and miscellaneous antiquities, which disclosed a new world to the scholars of Europe. A few weeks of hard work at the British Museum sufficed to open the cases and make a preliminary arrangement of their multifarious contents. Stein then went back to India and resumed his duties in the Education Department.

A brief account of the expedition first appeared in an official publication, a thin quarto issued by the King's printers in 1901, and entitled *Preliminary Report of a Journey of Archaeological and Topographical Exploration in Chinese Turkestan*, with a map and good photographic plates.

That volume was followed in 1903 by a substantial

octavo, entitled *Sand-buried Ruins of Khotan, a Personal Narrative*, published by Unwin. The book, which gives an extremely interesting, if somewhat diffuse, narrative of the expedition, was favourably received and attracted much attention. The most entertaining part of it is the chapter describing the inquiry which resulted in the full confession of the scamp, Islam Akhun, who had deceived the very elect by his daring forgeries of manuscripts and block-books in "unknown scripts", which had cost eminent scholars many hours of futile labour. I will not reopen old sores by recalling their names. The forger, who was proud of his profitable skill, explained in detail the methods of manufacture, and was kind enough to present Stein with one of the wooden blocks employed in printing his inventions.

"How much more proud would he have felt if he could but have seen, as I did a few months later, the fine morocco bindings with which a number of his block-printed forgeries had been honoured in a great European library ! "

Some of the products of his factory are now deposited in the "forgery" section of the Manuscript Department of the British Museum. The exposure of Islam Akhun was by no means the least of the valuable fruits gathered by the expedition. The guilty rascal had the impudence to ask Stein to take him to Europe in his service. The book contains a portrait of Islam Akhun.

The detailed scientific account of the same expedition, published in 1907 under the title *Ancient Khotan*, is a magnificent work in two large quarto volumes. I had the privilege of reading a proof for the author. The volume of text reprints a considerable part of *Sand-buried Ruins of Khotan*. The appendices contain contributions by eminent specialists. A mutilated Judæo - Persian document, edited by Professor Margoliouth, and dating from the early part of the eighth century after Christ, is of special interest as being "the earliest document in

modern Persian of any sort". The writer was a dealer in sheep and his letter relates to his business. It is written on paper. The separate volume of 119 plates, of which some are coloured, includes a fine map of the Khotan territory.

Stein's investigations were followed by several expeditions organized by France, Germany, and Japan, which added largely to his results, but of those foreign efforts this is not the place to speak. The surprising discoveries made by Stein alone would suffice to supply material for endless articles. The success won by the first brief expedition in the Khotan territory to the south of the Taklamakān Desert, the Gobi of old maps, whetted the appetite of both the explorer and the learned public, so that no long time elapsed before a second expedition was arranged to cover new ground as well as to re-examine the old.

*Second Expedition, from May, 1906, to December, 1908.*—The preliminary results of the extended second venture are presented in two thick octavo volumes under the title *Ruins of Desert Cathay, Personal Narrative of Explorations in Central Asia and Westernmost China, 1912*, well illustrated. It is convenient to borrow the language of a competent reviewer printed in the *Westminster Gazette* of March 30, 1912:—

"Dr. Stein was absent from India rather more than two and a half years (May, 1906–December, 1908). In the interval he traversed vast stretches of country from the unexplored passes of Afghan Wakhan and the Pamirs to far within the borders of Western China. He carried on excavations under trying conditions in remote ruined sites north and south of the Tarim desert, and in the Lop-Nor region. . . .

"The book is a fascinating one, rich in philological, archaeological, and geographical interest. . . . Some of the art treasures recovered by him have been made known to the public at the Festival of Empire exhibition, and quite a company of savants

has been enlisted in the study of the varied *trouvailles*. The volumes are, however, more than a record of discovery, although the discoveries include MSS. in many languages, specimens of quasi-Byzantine art from the Chinese border, ethnographical measurements, and a new Great Wall. They are replete with observations of men and manners. . . .

"Dr. Stein has a remarkable command of English. At times we may be conscious, no doubt, of excessive detail regarding plans, previsions, verification, and so forth. But we cannot resist a thrill in reading the cumulative account of the art, so livingly based upon the Greek, as it emerges from the sands of Lop-Nor, or the strange observation of the sentry track made by the feet of Chinese soldiers along their wall 2,000 years ago. We sympathise with the author in the mishap resulting from his final adventure among the mountains. We smile, perhaps a little grimly, as Dr. Stein himself seems to do, in reading of the delicate management whereby the childlike Chinese custodian, whose photograph is not withheld, was parted from his library of priceless MSS. and paintings. Rarely has a priest been so deeply betrayed by his patron saint."

I hope that I may be pardoned for also "conveying" a short extract from the *Times* review dated March 7, 1912:—

"Some idea of the services which Mr. Stein has conferred upon historical, archæological, and philological science may be gathered from the fact that, in addition to an enormous amount of topographical work for the Indian Survey Department, his harvest of ancient manuscripts and records comprises some 14,000 documents, in about a dozen scripts and languages (some unknown); enough, in fact, to occupy the labours of a large staff of Orientalists for years to come. Many of these relics are evidently of exceptional interest and value, notably those which come from that rich storehouse, the walled-in rock chamber of the Grotto of the Thousand Buddhas at Tun-huang, where they had lain, undisturbed by man and unharmed by time, during nine centuries. These include the oldest existing specimens of Chinese Buddhist pictorial art; block-printed texts dating from the ninth century; a Sanscrit MS. on palm leaves of the fourth

century; Runic-Turki, Tibetan, and Manichean writings; illuminated temple scrolls, banners, and ex-votos on silk and brocade, all miraculously preserved for their predestined resting place in the British Museum: Amongst other remarkable discoveries was the finding, in the rubbish-heap of a lonely watch-tower ruin, of the ancient Chinese "Limes", a script of Aramaic origin, written on paper, and dating from the first century. Of the finding of this document Mr. Stein observes that 'it seemed as if three civilizations, from the East, West, and South, had combined to leave their written traces at this lonely watch station in the desert, and with them to demonstrate also the earliest writing materials'. The same locality yielded a beautifully written and perfectly preserved tablet, containing the first chapter of a lexicographical Chinese work of the first century A.D., which is declared by M. Chavannes to be the earliest authentic specimen of a Chinese text. A striking proof this of the extraordinarily preservative power of the desert soil and climate."

It is impossible to give, by mere words, any idea of the richness of the collections brought to England. The wonderful silk pictures which were on exhibition at the British Museum some years ago must be seen to be appreciated. The coloured reproductions in the book, although excellent in their way, are far from being as impressive as the originals, which, it is hoped, may be again on view before long. The whole book is full of marvels discovered in the country to the north of the desert as well as in that to the south. In the course of his return journey Stein suffered severe injury from frost-bite, but nothing could damp his enthusiasm. As soon as possible he started on his third and most extended adventure of exploration.

*Third Expedition, from July 31, 1913, to March, 1916.*  
—On this occasion Stein succeeded in approaching the Pāmirs by a hitherto unexplored route through the Dard countries of Darel and Yasin. Starting from Śrīnagar in Kashmīr on July 31, he had crossed by September 5 no



less than fifteen passes, ranging in height from 10,000 to 17,400 feet, a wonderful feat of endurance and mountaineering skill. He notes that

“fully thirty miles from the nearest traceable bed of the Yarkand River, a small belt of eroded ground displayed on its surface abundant remains of the Stone Age, proving occupation by a Palaeolithic settlement of what is now absolutely lifeless desert. Neolithic arrow-heads turned up on similar ground nearer to Chok-tagh”.

Truly, the story of mankind is a long one.

On January 8, 1914, after passing through the Khotan territory, the explorer reached the small oasis called Charkhlik, “representing Marco Polo’s ‘City of Lop’”. At Miran, two marches further east, Stein succeeded in the troublesome task of removing intact and packing an “interesting frescoed dado with its cycle of youthful figures”. Still further east, at Lou-lan, on the ancient route of the Chinese silk trade, the explorer struck “a series of large grave pits which yielded a rich antiquarian haul in bewildering confusion”. The relics dated from the time of the Early Han Dynasty, beginning about the close of the second century B.C. “There was no time then to examine the wealth of beautiful designs and colours making a feast for my eyes.” The discovery “opened up a new and fascinating chapter in the history of textile art. It will take years to read it in full clearness”. Indications suggested that “the interval separating the latest Neolithic period in Lou-lan from the advent of the Chinese may not have been a very long one”. Still further east quantities of Chinese copper coins and bronze arrow-heads of Han times marked the course of the ancient track, and testified to “the magnitude of the traffic which had once moved through these barren solitudes”. Space fails to follow the adventure farther to the east and then to the north of the great desert. Stein was back again at Kashgar on May 31, 1915.

On July 6 he marched westwards and so made his way to the Russian territories on the Oxus. During the first half of September Stein was busy with "plentiful anti-quarian and anthropometric work" in Wakhan, and, as an extra, with collecting specimens of a new Pāmīr dialect, called Ishkashmī, one of seven such Iranian tongues now known to exist. On October 22 the traveller reached Samarkand.

From Russian Turkestan the unwearied traveller made a dash into Persia, reaching Meshed (Mashhad) on November 4. Thence he plunged into Seistan, and on a hill called Koh-i Khwāja discovered the remains of a large Buddhist monastery,

"the first ever traced on Iranian soil. Hidden behind later masonry there came to light remarkable fresco remains, dating back undoubtedly to the Sassanian period [A.D. 226-641]. Wall paintings, of a distinctly Hellenistic style and probably older, were found on the wall of a gallery below the high terrace bearing the main shrine. Protected in a similar way from the ravages of man and atmospheric moisture they had unfortunately suffered much from white ants. The importance of these pictorial relics, which I managed to remove safely in spite of various difficulties, is great. They illustrate for the first time *in situ* the Iranian link of the chain which, long surmised by conjecture, connects the Græco-Buddhist art of the extreme north-west of India with the Buddhist art of Central Asia and the Far East. This connexion was reflected with equal clearness by the architectural features of the ruins, which were also of great interest."

When writing in 1911 I had recorded the observation that "it is evident that the Turkistan paintings range over a long time, and that, when their sequence shall have been worked out, much light will be thrown upon the development of the pictorial art of Asia, including India". That proposition is doubtless true, but we must now take into consideration the unexpected frescoes in Seistan as well. The tour in Seistan was of the nature of a

reconnaissance, and had to be hurried too much to allow of much exploration in detail. The traveller found "an abundant archæological harvest literally on the surface", the objects including prehistoric pottery, neolithic implements, and relics of the bronze age. He also traced a line of ancient watch-stations, which reminded him of the great fortifications on the western frontier of China.

At the beginning of February, 1916, Stein set out on his return journey to India, travelling by the Seistan-Nushki trade-route, and keeping his eyes open. After the middle of March he returned to his starting-point Śrīnagar in Kashmīr, having been absent for nearly two years and eight months, during which he marched nearly 11,000 miles. His spoils consisted of 182 cases from Turkestan and twelve from Seistan.

Thus ended the third and probably the most important of Stein's wonderful expeditions. But at present hardly anything is known about its results. *Serindia*, the big book intended to supply a scientific account of the achievements of the second expedition, seems to be still far from publication, and it is obvious that we must wait patiently for a long time before we learn much of the discoveries made from 1913 to 1916.

The mass of material brought home from all the three expeditions is so enormous that it may be said that work on it will never be finished. When the explorations of persons employed by foreign authorities are also brought into consideration, the amount of labour needed to deduce coherent expositions of the whole is appalling to think of. Scores of experts may work at the hundreds of cases for generations without exhausting the subject.

Chinese Turkestan is of special interest as being the meeting-place of four distinct civilizations, Indian, Persian, Chinese, and Hellenistic, from, say, the third century B.C. to the ninth century after Christ. Khotan, Kashmīr, and Tibet were closely linked together by cultural bonds, and

the Buddhist art of China and Japan is derived from the Hellenistic art of Gandhāra through Khotan. Political and religious history receives equal illumination, while the subsidiary science of numismatics has been enriched by a multitude of novel facts. The linguistic discoveries are of such astonishing richness that it is impossible to extend this article by any attempt to notice them. Perhaps Sir George Grierson may find leisure to give some account of the new knowledge gained.

The expeditions enable us to realize the ancient state of Chinese Turkestan in every minute detail of domestic, business, and military life for several centuries. Anybody who looks at the pictures in any of Stein's books or visits the collections in the British Museum will understand what is meant. Words would be useless to give any idea of the richness and significance of the collections.

Stein always works at high pressure, whether in the field or in the study, and gets through an astonishing amount of literary work of high quality. The only adverse criticism to which it is exposed is that his books exhibit a certain diffuseness and would sometimes be improved by reduction in bulk. But he has never had time to do much pruning, and all his publications are fascinating as they stand. Nobody else living, except the fellow-workers in the same field to whom allusion has been made, has enjoyed such opportunities for astonishing discoveries on a huge scale, and it may well be doubted if any rival can equal Sir M. A. Stein in his treatment of his only too copious material.

VINCENT A. SMITH.

---

THE PANJAB HISTORICAL SOCIETY

*A Correction*

My statement (*ante*, Journal for 1918, p. 660) that the Society was established by Sir John Marshall and the staff of the Panjab University is not perfectly accurate.

Professor Dr. J. Vogel, of the University of Leiden, informs me by letter dated November 23, 1918, that the Society was founded on October 1, 1910, by himself, then officiating as Director-General of Archæology, Mr. J. E. Thompson, C.I.E., and Mr. Woolner, Registrar of the Panjab University, with twelve other gentlemen. At that date Sir John Marshall was on furlough. He joined as soon as possible, and gave the young society valuable support. The first general meeting of the society was held on December 27, in the same year.

V. A. S.

---

"ANGLO-INDIAN" = EURASIAN

Most people have been accustomed to use the term "Anglo-Indian" to denote the class of persons of British nationality who reside in India for a considerable time as members of the public services, or as non-officials for commercial or other purposes. Using the term in that sense we speak of "Anglo-Indian society", "literature", and so forth.

The decision of the Government of India some years ago to employ officially the term "Anglo-Indian" instead of "Eurasian" to denote the considerable body of people of mixed blood, usually descended from an European father and an Indian mother, came as a shock to established usage. That feeling of shock is forcibly expressed by Mr. William Archer in his interesting book *India and the Future* (Hutchinson, 1917) in these words:—

"By 'Anglo-Indian' I mean Anglo-Indian, not Eurasian. The attempt to divert to a new and inappropriate use a word so thoroughly established in the English language can lead to nothing but confusion."

The present official signification of the term "Anglo-Indian", however, is not "new", as Mr. Archer and most people suppose it to be. It was used in the sense

now given to it so far back as 1826 by Sir John Malcolm, who wrote:—

“ANGLO-INDIANS

The descendants of Europeans by native mothers, usually termed half-castes, or Anglo-Indians, if they do not form a part of the English community in India, are closely allied to it. . . . We can look to no period when the Anglo-Indians, as a body, are likely to form any dangerous ties with the Mahomedan or Hindu part of the community. . . . The real consequence of the Anglo-Indians, in the eyes of the natives and their own, arises chiefly from their connection with Europeans. . . . Strong objections have been taken to the measure of allowing the Anglo-Indians to hold lands.”—*Political History*, ii, pp. 260–4.

The employment of the depreciatory term “half-caste” should be sedulously avoided. The word “Eurasian”, although inoffensive in form, seems to be disliked by the class to which it is applied, and it is clear that the revival of Malcolm’s sense of the term “Anglo-Indian” was intended to soothe a ruffled sense of self-respect. But the fact remains that the ambiguity noted by Mr. Archer is inconvenient, and the general public will be slow to adopt the official terminology. I am not prepared to suggest any better alternative.

V. A. S.

---

ETYMOLOGICAL NOTES

I. Talmudic **שׁוֹנֵן** = Assyrian *epēšu*.

There occurs in the Talmudic literature the phrase **שׁוֹנֵן אֵין**, the meaning of which is “I have no desire (to)”, “I do not wish (to)”, “I have nothing to do (with)”. The etymology of **שׁוֹנֵן** is not known. The suggestions to be found in the dictionaries (see Levy, Neuhebr. u. Chald. Wörterbuch, s.v., and Jastrow, A Dictionary of the Targumim, etc., s.v.) are impossible.

I submit that we have in this word **שׁוֹנֵן** the Aramaic equivalent of the Assyrian verb *epēšu*, “to do, to make.” **שׁוֹנֵן אֵין** would mean literally “it is not my doing”; more

fully "I have nothing to do (with it)". "I have nothing to do (with it)," which easily assumes the meaning of "I do not wish", "I do not desire to", gives excellent sense in all the Talmudic and Midrashic passages in which 'ש'נ' occurs.

SAMUEL DAICHES.

---

CORRECTION in Book-notice, Journal of the Royal Asiatic Society, July and October, 1918, p. 631 :—

Owing to two of the printers' characters having fallen out at the ends of the third and second lines from below, the translation of the Babylonian tablet there given is somewhat confused. I therefore repeat it here :—

"A field, as much as there is, a field of sesame and grain, the field of Hadi-wamer-Šamaš, Rammānu-šarri-ili and Hadi-wamer-Šamaš have hired from Hadi-wamer-Šamaš, the lord of the field, as a (field of) partnership, for a year."

Portions of a phrase omitted in compiling the Book-notice have also been inserted.

CORRECTION in the JRAS. for October, 1917 :—

p. 731, in the last line but one of the Translation, for "As we would not disobey thee", read "So as not to disobey (?) thee".

pp. 732-3, strike out "In all probability", etc., to the end of the paragraph.

T. G. PINCHES.

---

## NOTICES OF BOOKS

---

FOLKLORE IN THE OLD TESTAMENT: STUDIES IN COMPARATIVE RELIGION, LEGEND, AND LAW. By Sir JAMES GEORGE FRAZER. 3 vols. Macmillan and Co., Ltd. 1918. £1 17s. 6d. net.

Personally it gives me great pleasure to find the folklore in the Old Testament systematically examined, and still greater pleasure to find that the examiner is Sir James Frazer. He has, indeed, given us here three volumes of some 1,700 pages, crammed, as one might have expected, with valuable facts and illuminating comparisons, and with suggestions enough to keep the thoughtful thinking for a long while.

His work does not, however, pretend to be a complete encyclopædia of the folklore to be found in the Old Testament. In fact, such very important points as "the sacrifice of the firstborn, the law of the uncleanness of women, and the custom of the scapegoat" have been deliberately left out of his present purview, because Sir James has already dealt with them elsewhere. His plan in this book is his well-known one of taking up certain definite problems and proceeding to investigate them by the comparative method in great detail, sometimes making suggestions as to the true selection from the resulting deductions, and sometimes leaving the problems open for the reader to draw his own conclusions. Perhaps, as there is still so much left out, the work, as in previous cases, will be much expanded at some future time. Let us hope so.

Although uncompromising in his statement of the evidence of the survivals of savagery locked up in the phraseology and statements of the Old Testament, Sir James has unbounded admiration for the "higher



side of the Hebrew genius which has manifested itself in a spiritual religion and a pure morality, and of which the Old Testament is the imperishable monument". An admiration which leads him to ask: "in what other volume shall we find, side by side with that melancholy record [the annals of savagery and superstition], psalmists who poured forth their sweet and solemn strains of meditative piety in the solitude of the hills or in the green pastures and beside still waters; prophets who lit up their beatific visions of a blissful future with the glow of an impassioned imagination; historians who bequeathed to distant ages the scenes of a remote past embalmed for ever in the amber of a pellucid style?" Without in any way wishing to detract from the glories of the brighter side of the Old Testament records or to belittle the splendour of the translations into our own language, I would suggest to Sir James that if he were to apply his comparative method to the sacred literature of other Semitic races and of other Indo-European races as developed in the East, he would find that much of what is quoted above can be said of "other volumes". There is a reason why the Vedic hymns, the Pahlavi *gathas*, the Pali texts, and those of the Qur'ân have had and still have such a hold on the people who believe in them; and that reason may be expressed very much in the terms used by Sir James of the Old Testament. Years ago I knew a fine old Muhammadan Sirdar in the Punjab, who made a point of calling on me periodically to explain that if I would only digest his selections from his sacred writers I could not fail to perceive the superiority of the Muhammadan moral teachings over the Christian. I knew later on a Burmese Sayādaw, head of a monastery, who explained that it was useless to try and convert Buddhists to Christianity as the Christians had no new moral lesson to teach the Buddhists. I have heard highly educated Hindus say the same thing, and Parsees who were puzzled at the

Christian assumption of a superior moral teaching. There must be a reason for all this, and it seems to be that in all high civilization religious ritual is leavened by folklore and religious philosophy by a high morality. The two go side by side and together are a phenomenon of a stage or stages of human mental culture, though each has usually a separate historical development. Hence, each can be studied by itself, and the study of the folklore in a faith need not encroach on that of its philosophy. The study of both is essential to the proper understanding of the mental attitude at any given period of the people holding the faith, and the comparative method is in both cases "the instrument for the detection of savagery under civilization". Hence the value of volumes such as these under notice.

The first problem that Sir James tackles is the Old Testament story of the Creation of Man, very properly pointing out that the first and second chapters of Genesis are incompatible, and contain, in fact, a record of two separate accounts that had been handed down in Hebrew tradition. One of these stories is much older than the other; the older being "folklore" and the newer a priestly version of the folklore, a modification of it adapted to current ideas of propriety. God the Creator in the older version is highly anthropomorphic, much more so than in the newer: and it may be pointed out here that we have lately had much evidence during the great European war that the Jehovistic, i.e. highly anthropomorphic, view of God has by no means even now died out among Christians of superior civilization. With many the conception of God is as full of "folklore" as ever.

After going into cosmogonic tales from all parts of the world and during all times known to us, Sir James suggests no solution, perhaps wisely. We are all mentally the product of our forbears and environment, and as full

of prejudices as ever they were, so it is safest to leave the question open. The position is summed up thus: "The foregoing examples may serve to illustrate two very different views which primitive man has taken of his own origin. They may be distinguished as the theory of creation and the theory of evolution. According to the one the human race was fashioned in its present form by a great artificer, whether a god or a hero; according to the other, it was evolved by a natural process out of lower forms of animal or even vegetable life. Roughly speaking, these two theories still divide the civilized world between them. The partisans of each can appeal in support of their view to a large consensus of opinion; and if truth were to be decided by weighing the one consensus against the other, with *Genesis* in one scale and *The Origin of Species* in the other, it might perhaps be found, when the scales were finally trimmed, that the balance hung very even between creation and evolution." In the existing conditions of belief and argument it is perhaps best to follow Sir James in his wisdom, and leave this tremendous question where he has left it.

The next great question tackled is the Fall of Man. Sir James has grappled with this matter in a manner that frankly rouses my admiration. He writes of the Biblical story: "We may suppose that in the original form of the narrative there were two trees, a Tree of Life and a Tree of Death, and that man was allowed to eat of the Tree of Life, but forbidden to eat of the Tree of Death." And that probably the intention of the Creator was "to confer immortality on His creature, man, and was only frustrated in His amiable intention by the cunning of the serpent. In the original narrative the serpent's motive for beguiling the woman was probably to cheat men of the boon of immortality and confer it on the serpents, which are commonly supposed to be immortal, because they cast their skins and thereby renew their

youth". Finally, Sir James regards "the story of the Fall of Man in its original form as an explanation of the origin of death". All this sets him exploring folktales gathered round immortality and death and the serpent, which he collects under the Story of the Perverted Message to account for the origin of death—the belief "that God at one time purposed to make mankind immortal, but that the benevolent scheme miscarried through no fault of the messenger to whom He entrusted the gospel message". He then goes on to the Story of the Cast Skin to account for immortality, especially of the serpent, and thirdly to a composite story of both the foregoing ideas. Thus the Story of the Fall of Man arose out of "savage" attempts to explain the phenomenon of death and the belief in immortality.

The author then passes on to the Mark of Cain. Whatever it was, he discards the solution that it was a tribal mark, tattooed and other, and shows by analogy that it was to protect the murderer in his wanderings from the scene of the spilt blood which "polluteth the land: and no expiation can be made for the land for the blood that is shed therein, but by the blood of him that shed it". In his conclusion on this point Sir James points out in a fine passage how the superstitions which caused the fear of uncovered blood shown in the Biblical narrative of the murder of Abel "may have served a useful purpose in the evolution of morality by reinforcing the sanctity of human life".

The bulk of the first volume is taken up with an examination of the Story of the Great Flood. Sir James goes into the almost universal stories of a deluge at great length, and seems to arrive at what appears to me to be a sensible conclusion, that there is "no reason to think that any diluvial tradition is older than a few thousand years", and that such as exist are due to recollections of some terrible local calamity, or "are not legendary but

purely mythical: they describe catastrophes that never occurred. They are examples of that class of mythical tales which, with Sir Edward Tylor, we may call myths of observation, since they "are suggested by a true observation of nature, but are incorrect in their interpretation of it", e.g. the observation of marine fossils found on mountains or in other places remote from the sea. The Hebrew story is derived from a Babylonian or rather Sumerian source, and cannot be the origin of all the great flood stories of the world. It is very pleasing to find in going over the many tales quoted by Sir James Frazer, that he is quite wide awake to the danger of mistaking a missionary's description of the Biblical narrative dished up in "native" form for a genuine folktale.

We are then taken to the Tower of Babel and the many attempts to account for and find out the origin of the diversity of tongues, which in this case do not predicate much intelligence of observation on the part of "the folk".

With this subject Sir James leaves the early ages of the world or general history according to the ancient Hebrews, and passes to the particular legends of their own race. He is hardly less interesting here, commencing with the Covenant of Abraham and its bearing on the ratification of agreements, and going on to the heirship of Jacob and the very wide subject of ultimogeniture and its causes, including the supposititious *Jus Primæ Noctis*, which is carefully explained and gone into.

The heirship of Jacob as the youngest son involves, in the story of the kid-skins and the deception of his father (which is explained as arising out of scholastic necessity to interpret a fact in entire divergence from the current custom of primogeniture), a reminiscence of the legal fiction of a new birth on changing social status, through a ritual in which sacrificial skins formed a part.

Jacob is the subject of much folk-legend—his dream, the heavenly ladder and the sacred stone; his meeting

with Rachel at the well and the Jewish custom of the watering of the flocks; and his bursting into tears on kissing Rachel there, alluding to the widespread custom, well known to Sir James and incidentally to the present writer, of weeping as a salutation. His marriage to two sisters, who were his cross-cousins, gives rise to a most interesting series of age-wide and world-wide inquiries into many connected customs, leading to the valuable conclusion "that marriages like that of Jacob have been and still are practised in many different parts of the world. In marrying his cross-cousins, the daughters of his mother's brother, in wedding the elder sister before the younger, and in serving his father-in-law for a term of years for each of his wives, the patriarch conformed to customs which are fully recognized and strictly observed by many races", affirming that "the portraiture of manners in Jacob's biography is no mere fancy picture, but drawn from the life".

The story of Jacob and the mandrakes alludes to the very widely-spread nostrum for procuring sons by eating fruit, among many other methods, and it is interesting to find Rachel and Leah fully acquainted with it, though Sir James does not bring out this side of the story. The Covenant of the Cairn leads Sir James, after an amusing account of Jacob's flight with his wives and his father-in-law's goods, to expatiate on the setting up of a cairn to mark their ultimate reconciliation, on the principle of sympathetic magic—the stones giving stability to the contract—still in practice in Syria. Jacob's all-night wrestle with the angel at the ford of the Jabbok is explained as a reminiscence of a story of a struggle with the river god or spirit till the break of day, a common form of folktale and source of custom.

The stories of the Patriarchs are wound up by that of Joseph's divining cup hidden in Benjamin's sack, and to the folklore connected with such cups.

Passing on to the later times of the Judges and the Kings we arrive at the national history of Israel, with the great figure of Moses, a copious source of legend and story. It begins with his exposure in the ark of bulrushes, which leads Sir James to remark that this is true folklore, with many parallels in the legends of striking personalities of old time, perhaps due to a reminiscence of a water ordeal to test legitimacy.

The story of the Passage through the Red Sea is illustrated by similar exploits of Alexander the Great and Scipio the Younger at Carthage, which have a natural and a legendary aspect. Of the Waters of Meribah Sir James has not much to say, though he quotes a parallel from the Celebes. Let us hope as time goes on that he may collect more.

Passing by the chapters on the story of Gideon's men, whom he selected by their mode of drinking water, and Jotham's Fable of the Trees, which both show the acuteness of Sir James Frazer's eye for folktale parallels, we come to the important legend of Samson and Delilah and the widespread belief in the virtue that lies in the hair. The story of David and Abigail yields a rich chapter on the Bundle of Life ("the soul of my lord shall be bound in the bundle of life with the Lord thy God") and the worldwide belief in the External Soul. Then comes the pathetic visit of Saul in perplexity and apprehension to the Witch of Endor, the ghost-seer, and the old-world, and for that matter new-world, belief in spirit medicines, followed by David's sin in taking a census of his people, which is referred to sheer superstition equally widespread. But may it not have some reference to the almost universal Eastern idea of the Evil Eye punishing pride of possession? In the legend of Solomon and the Queen of Sheba, any one versed in Eastern legend and story will be reminded of many old acquaintances in her riddles, and no doubt Sir James will in due course bring this fact into prominence.

A consideration of the three officials at the Temple at Jerusalem, called the Keepers of the Threshold, opens up a valuable disquisition on the superstition of the sanctity of the threshold, which Sir James attributes to the spirits that are supposed to haunt it. This is followed by a short but most interesting chapter on the Bird-sanctuary. The author quotes the opening verse of the 84th Psalm: "How amiable are thy tabernacles, O Lord of Hosts! . . . the sparrow hath found her an house and the swallow a nest for herself." A far-off echo of this idea may be found in the family motto of the present writer, taken from this very verse in its older Latin form when it was the 83rd Psalm—"Templa quam dilecta (tua, Domine virtutum)"—which, besides the pun on the name, refers, as I understand, to the old blazon of two bars each charged with three martlets, with a martlet (the footless swift, itself a "folklore" bird) for the crest. Another bird legend—that of Elijah and the ravens—gives rise to an inquiry leading up to the idea of kinship between man and beasts and birds of prey (such as the raven) which batten on human corpses, apparently as part of the general idea of sympathetic magic.

An illuminating chapter on the sacred oaks and terebinths of Palestine leads up to another on the High Places of Israel with their oaks or terebinths and sacred pillars and poles.

The analogy between the Hebrew word for "widow" and the word for "dumb" leads Sir James to an important series of remarks on the silence imposed on widows by many peoples, though he has a caution at the end of them against building theories on "doubtful etymologies", even if accepted by high authority.

Perhaps the shortest of all the chapters is that on Jonah and the Whale, and I cannot help regretting that this great stumbling-block of the Old Testament has not been gone into more fully by comparison with available folklore.



This part of the book winds up with the story of Jehovah and the Lions, which gives rise to an important discussion of the ethical standard of "Jehovah, the God of the land", well worth study.

Sir James Frazer concludes his studies of *some* of the folklore in the early books of the Bible by an inquiry into a few points of the Law, which he introduces by a chapter of great value on the Place of the Law in Jewish History. Especially, to my mind, he does well to lay stress on the distinction between legislation and codification. This is an all-important point to bear in mind in studying the primitive law of any people. Codified oral law was real law and custom and obeyed; reported legislation not necessarily so. The late King of Burma, Thibaw, was a scholarly man, very "learned in the Law" as understood by the Buddhists, and delighted in issuing edicts containing the loftiest sentiments couched in quite beautiful language, which were dutifully accepted by his courtiers—but, then, no one ever dreamt of carrying them out.

In his notices of a few of the precepts of the ancient Jewish law Sir James naturally confines himself to those which reflect the folklore of the time. The first point he takes is the tenth of the original ritual version of the Ten Commandments—"Thou shalt not seethe a kid in its mother's milk"—a stumbling-block to critics of all times. And yet it was looked on as a most important law. Sir James examines the question at great length to show that it may probably be referred to sympathetic magic, based, in the interests of the milch animals of a pastoral people, on the sympathy between a mother animal and its milk.

The old Hebrew law of boring the ear of a slave who refused to go free is gone into at still greater length to show that it was the result of primitive logic: "you can show your control of a man by the simple process of cutting his ear and drawing a few drops of his blood."

In the useful chapter which follows this the well-known Hebrew custom of cutting the body and shearing the hair in mourning for the dead is fully discussed, with a view to showing that it persevered in spite of being directly forbidden by "the Law", because of the belief that it in some way gratified or benefited the dead, implying a previous "propitiation or worship of the dead".

The only trial by ordeal known to the Jewish Law, that of a suspected adulteress, by making her drink a "bitter water" which had been previously ceremonially cursed, leads to a long inquiry into the ordeal by poison, which is very old and widespread. The object of the curse was obviously to render the water poisonous, and its use among a civilized people is evidence of its antiquity as a survival of savagery.

By the oldest Code embodied in the Pentateuch an ox that had gored a man or woman was judicially put to death, and Sir James shows that right up to modern times in civilized Europe the custom of judicial punishment of animals that have injured or have been supposed to injure human beings arises out of the general savage law of blood revenge.

And, finally, Sir James, with many illustrations, refers the golden bells in the fringe of the blue (violet) full-dress robe of the Jewish priest to the worldwide idea that the sound of bells frightens away evil spirits—an idea that has led to many poetical customs, of course quite differently explained by their followers, all the world over.

Although I have thus gone at great apparent length through the whole of Sir James Frazer's remarks and arguments, I cannot but feel that I have merely touched the fringe of them, and that his book itself hardly goes beyond the fringe of his mighty subject. Also I cannot help hoping that he has it in his mind to enlighten us

still further in his own inimitable way. He has so much of the imagination of the poet in him and so much of the poet's power of expression that he is able to bring before us with extraordinary vividness the scenes in which the old Hebrews acted and the thoughts and emotions that prompted them to act. So much of both, indeed, has he that one hardly feels that one is encroaching on his good-nature in asking him for more, where so much more must surely be forthcoming.

Should he be able to fall in with such wishes, may I suggest a point of inquiry well worth following up in the older parts of the Bible—the ancient commercial transactions in the days before coined money. There is no study I know that so closely brings home to one the daily life of a people at any given period of its civilization, and it is one also that can help us to guess at the stage of the civilization. Abraham bought the Cave of Machpelah with money (?silver) that he weighed out, and its value was assessed in terms of money—a transaction which has caused me to doubt that we have the story in its original form. *Prima facie* it does not fit in with one's ideas of an early pastoral people. Joseph's brethren carried "bundles of money". One would like to know more of this, though it was in point of time and place quite a possible occurrence. As one who has lived amongst a people—in their own opinion highly civilized, and no one could say they were not so in many senses—who had no coined money, and weighed and assessed all their bullion for every payment, I feel that a comparative study by an anthropologist of the pecuniary transactions of the ancient Hebrews could not but prove of much value to the student of man and his ways and thoughts.

R. C. TEMPLE.

---

L'ART GRÉCO-BOUDDHIQUE DU GANDHĀRA. Tome II,  
I. fascicule : LES IMAGES. Par A. FOUCHER. Paris:  
Imprimerie Nationale. 1918.

During the past few years a number of important works have appeared illustrating the Iconography of the Religions of the East, and especially of those which arose in India known as Buddhism and Hinduism, "or Brahmanism." Among these those of M. Foucher stand out pre-eminently as excelling all their predecessors in the art of lucid exposition and in the systematic interpretation of the scenes represented in the early sculptures. In his great work *L'Art Gréco-Bouddhique du Gandhāra*, of which the first volume was published in 1905, he selected as his subject the elucidation of the numerous sculptures which have been discovered during the last seventy years in the countries anciently known as Gandhāra and Udyāna, included in the kingdoms of the Greek or Macedonian conquerors of Kabul and North-West India and of their "barbaric" successors. The appearance of this first volume marks an epoch in the study of this form of art, sprung from the contact between East and West, the earlier stages of which study are found in the period beginning with H. H. Wilson's *Ariana Antiqua* and ending with Dr. Burgess's edition of Grünwedel's *Buddhist Art in India*.

M. Foucher's work had a far wider scope than any of its predecessors, and included a systematic interpretation of the reliefs considered first with regard to their style and secondly with regard to their subjects. As regards subject it dealt first with the Legend of the Bodhisattva, examining the scenes in which the previous existences of the Buddha, comprised under the title of Jātakas, were illustrated. From these it passed to the descent of the Buddha to earth, his nativity, childhood, youth, and marriage. Then follow the scenes of his vocation,

renunciation, and illumination, followed by those dealing with his mission and miracles. Finally, come those of his *pari-nirvāṇa* and the events which followed his disappearance from the visible world, concluding with the partition of his relics. In all these sections it is not too much to say that M. Foucher has shed a flood of light on every part of the subject, and has shown that a complete pictorial history of the life and legend of the Buddha as understood in the first century B.C. and the early centuries of our era may be discovered in the Gandhāra sculptures. At this point his first volume stopped, and students of the subject have been awaiting eagerly the appearance of the second volume, in which further important developments were confidently expected.

After thirteen years we have received the first part of the second volume. From M. Foucher's preface we understand that the first proofs were dated in September, 1913, and that it is to the outbreak of the Great War in the summer of 1914 that we must attribute the delay in publication. While working on this volume M. Foucher published several important essays on branches of the same subject, which have been translated into English by Miss L. A. Thomas and Dr. F. W. Thomas under the title of "Beginnings of Buddhist Art", and appear in their English dress almost simultaneously with vol. ii of *L'Art Gréco-Bouddhique du Gandhāra*. These essays should be read in connexion with the disquisitions in the volume now under consideration, especially those dealing with the Yakshas, Vajrapāṇi, and the male and female deities considered by M. Foucher under the title of the "Tutelary Pair".

M. Foucher deals here not so much with the scenes themselves as with certain beings who frequently appear and reappear in them, and he regards these from the point of view of social position or caste. His theory is that the prototype of one group is to be found in the

lower castes of the Indian population, of another in the middle castes, that is in the Vaiśyas of the ancient classification, while the highest group, comprising the Bodhisattvas and the higher gods, finds its origin in the kings and nobles of North-West India. He then considers certain beings who were outside and beyond all caste distinctions. First among these comes Buddha himself, then come the ascetics of various kinds, the Buddhist and Brahmanist devotees, the Jains, and others of a similar nature. We have therefore in this volume what may be called a cross-division of the subject, each class of beings being considered in a group irrespective of the scene in which it appears. These groups are dealt with under the following titles: "The Lower Castes" (ch. x), "The Middle Castes" (ch. xi), "The Highest Castes" (ch. xii), "Those outside Caste" (ch. xiii), under which is included a disquisition on the type of Buddha.

Certain general questions are dealt with in the last chapter of the instalment now published (ch. xiv) under the title "General Review of the Images".

In ch. x M. Foucher deals with the lower castes as represented in Gandhāra sculpture under the following heads:—

1. Pariahs and demons.
2. Nāgas and Suparṇas.
3. Yakṣas.
4. Vajrapāṇi.
5. Women and fairies.

In the first section we may perhaps regret the use of the term "Pariah" which belongs to the Hinduism of South India, and never was and is not now used in North-West India. Nor does the position of the menial classes appear to have been so degraded as that occupied by the Paraiyans of the South, and the sculptures, as M. Foucher observes, do not give any support to the idea that such was the case. The menial and servile classes

are dealt with under this head as they existed in real life, and under the succeeding heads as the typical forms adopted for certain of the lower grades of supernatural beings. Under the first head we have grooms, wrestlers, athletes, hired assassins, soldiers (or armed demons), ploughmen, grass-cutters, and the whole assembly of Yakṣas and Yakṣiṇīs, those wild creatures of the woods and waters, oreads, nereids, or whatever we may call them, which play such a large part in Buddhist sculpture from Barāhat or Sāñchī onwards.

M. Foucher now considers that in his vol. i he did not sufficiently recognize the importance in this respect of what he then styled "decorative motifs", and few will quarrel with him for the view he now takes, which throws much light on the subject. The type of the Yakṣa is undoubtedly that adopted for the lower classes of human beings, and it may be permitted to a student of anthropology to go further, and to maintain that they represent those wild and shy races which still haunt the hills and forests of Central India, and we may presume were not unrepresented 2,000 years ago in the mountains round about Gandhāra and in the jungles and reed-beds of the Indus, where a similar physical type may yet be found among some of the hunting and fishing castes. The figures which we know under the names of centaurs, victories, tritons, atlantes, etc., are now all, with good reason, to be considered as Yakṣas or their children.

This leads up to the Nāgas and their persecutors the Suparṇas or Garuḍas. On this point M. Foucher develops the idea set forth in his first volume, and in previous works especially that of Grünwedel and Burgess. The Nāgas have their origin doubtless in some indigenous race, but this cannot be said of their enemies. Garuḍa, as M. Foucher notes, never assumed a human aspect in Gandhāra art; it was reserved for a more modern period, when he became the carrier of Vishnu, to give him

a human semblance, only slightly suggesting his origin by a beak-like nose. Yet, as M. Foucher has noted, the eagle in his fig. 318 is wearing a turban and earrings, so the process of development may be considered to have commenced. I may note here that the scene of the carrying off of a Nāgini by Garuḍa is represented in almost purely Greek style in an intaglio in my possession which strongly suggests the Rape of Ganymede as its origin.

The most interesting and convincing essay under this chapter is that on the much vexed question of Vajrapāṇi. The theory of M. Foucher, which he claims is a development of that of M. S. Oldenbourg (p. 48, n. 1), identifies Vajrapāṇi as an attendant on Buddha with the Yakṣa already attached as a familiar spirit to all great personages, and on this wide, and as he says "apparently solid" foundation, he proposes to rebuild the identification of Vajrapāṇi. He appears first, as an undoubted Yakṣa, in attendance on Buddha as a faithful follower. In fig. 326, in which he waves a *chaurī*, we have one of the best representations of him in this character (I recognize in this an old friend, as it was once in my own possession). That the original Vajrapāṇi was considered to be a member of the Guhyaka clan of Yakṣas is proved by quotations from the Lalita Vistara (p. 50).

M. Foucher then proceeds to consider the great diversity of forms assumed by Vajrapāṇi which have been the subject of so much discussion. He finds the origin of these multiform apparitions in the similar varieties already attributed to Yakṣas in general, whose undecided type he shared. We find thus among the winged Atlantean figures so frequently found in Gandhāra art exactly the same varieties as we find in the figures of Vajrapāṇi. These are undoubtedly Yakṣas, and appear sometimes as bearded men, at others as smooth-faced youths, and again as *putti* or Eros-like figures. The Greek tendencies of the



artists led them to give those indeterminate forms the appearance of Greek gods or demigods such as Hermes, Dionysus, Hercules, or Pan, but under all these disguises he remains a Yakṣa. The one constant factor in his appearances is the thunderbolt which denotes the magic power of Buddha. M. Foucher does not deal with the speculations as to the ultimate origin of the idea of Vajrapāṇi (such as that of Mrs. Spooner connecting it with the Fravashī of the Avesta), as he considers this beyond the scope of his work. In the same way his future developments in the later Mahāyānist schools are not here dealt with.

In ch. xi the subject is the representation of the middle classes, with whom are classed certain of the minor deities. The large group of donors, male and female, shows clearly the Indian and foreign types included among the human members of this class, and on his identification of these M. Foucher bases his argument for placing the minor divine beings in the same division. Among the numerous Indian figures appear others which from their costume we cannot do otherwise than consider as Scythians, either followers of the Kuṣan kings or perhaps sometimes the kings themselves. In one unidentified Jātaka scene in the British Museum a bound figure is brought before a king of this type, and the standing figure 352, p. 93, holding a relic-vase (which has unfortunately lost its head), bears an extraordinary resemblance in attitude and costume to Kaniṣka himself as he appears on his coins and in his statues. This figure and others representing kings, even if "barbaric" rather than Greek or Indian in costume, should, it would seem, have been grouped with the upper rather than with the middle classes. The most interesting part of this chapter deals with the genius of wealth usually identified with Kuvēra and with his consort Hārītī, who are classed together as the "Tutelary Pair". M. Foucher maintains

that the genius of wealth, the consort of Hāritī, is not Kuvēra but his principal follower and general, Pāñcika, and he produces some passages from Indian and Chinese texts which seem to be decisive on this point. The lance borne by certain of the best-known figures of this personage he considers as a symbol of his military office. He finds an analogy to this lance-bearing figure, not in any of the Kuṣān kings, but in the figures of their generals, among whom he classes the chief hitherto known to numismatists as Heraus or Miaus, whom he supposes to be a nameless Saka described as *Hiau*, that is the Yao or Yab-gau serving under the Kuṣān kings. He points out that the face of this chief bears a strong resemblance to that of the celebrated Lahore statue, of which his figures 367 and 368 give a better representation than any as yet published. The resemblance is certainly strong, although the feeble effort of the engraver of the coin-die suffers much when compared with the work of the great artist of the Lahore statue. The theory is attractive and deserves the careful attention of numismatists. If we grant that the original genius of wealth was rather Pāñcika than Kuvēra, it is none the less certain that Kuvēra, in the later developments of Central Asia, Tibet, China, and Japan, borrowed the characteristics and attributes of his lieutenant, which, indeed, have been shared by the other three *lokapālas*. Here the martial attributes are most prominent, while in mediaeval India, Ceylon, and Java we find the genius of wealth undisguised with his money-bags, his purse, or his mongoose vomiting pearls. The subject is an extensive one, and M. Foucher's arguments make a full consideration of the subject imperative on students of Buddhist iconography.

In his study of Hāritī, the consort in Gandhāra art of the genius of wealth, M. Foucher does not make any new departure as to her identification, but supports the theory that she commenced her career as the goddess or demon

of smallpox, from which a natural development constituted her the protectress against that disease. Hence, instead of the infant-devouring ogress she became the benevolent good fairy who was the special friend of children, although her terrible aspect did not disappear altogether, as we may see in the boar's tusks projecting from her mouth in the Sahr-i-Bahlöl statue (ASI, 1911-12, fig. 16), and persists even now, with occasional reappearances even in Japan (p. 139). But the most important point in this study is the recognition in Hārītī of the origin of the "Buddhist Madonna", Kwan-yin, now considered to be a female form of Avalōkitēśvara.

The study of these figures is completed by a consideration of the reliefs, where they appear jointly seated side by side as a conjugal pair, sometimes in more or less amorous attitudes. In these groups Hārītī often carries the classical *cornucopiæ*, as the goddess of plenty. M. Foucher recognizes the same two demigods in the repoussé silver plate in the British Museum (fig. 390, and *Archæologia*, 1897, p. 534), and a consideration of the series of reliefs which he has brought together leads irresistibly to the belief that he is right in this attribution. Compare, for instance, the costume, the buskins or stockings of figs. 387 and 389 with those of the drunken divinity of the silver plate, whose wine-skin, as M. Foucher observes, seems to be a development of Pāñcika's money-bag. Finally, we come to the evidence derived from the coins of the Parthian, Saka, and Kuṣān kings where M. Foucher finds representations of both Pāñcika and Hārītī among the coins of these rulers. It is impossible here to deal fully with this argument, which deserves full and careful examination. It is sufficient to observe that a good *prima facie* case has been made out for the identification. Indeed, on a coin of Azes (Whitehead's *Catalogue of the Coins in the Lahore Museum*, i, pl. xi, 217), both Pāñcika and Hārītī are recognized on the

obverse and reverse of the same coin under the guise of Hermes and Demeter; and in the god and goddess standing side by side on a coin of Azilises (pl. xiii, 334, of the same collection), as well as in the well-known coin of Zeionises, where a goddess of the city type is crowning the king, M. Foucher thinks that perhaps we may find the same tutelary pair under an easily penetrated alias. Even if every one of these identifications cannot be sustained, enough has been established to justify M. Foucher in holding as proved his theory as to the origin of this remarkable couple, which has undergone such a vast extension and development in after ages. As he says, it may at first cause astonishment that an ex-demon and a former ogress should have attained such promotion, but he proceeds to point out that all the world over the desire of wealth and offspring supplies the most powerful impulses to worship, and indeed to students of anthropology there will be nothing surprising in the theory, but rather an indication of the universal process by which the underlying feelings of the people work their way to the surface, and by which, as we see here, the obscure beliefs of an indigenous population asserted themselves through the beliefs of a new creed and the forms of a foreign art.

Under the title of the "Upper Castes" M. Foucher deals in ch. xii with the representations of kings and nobles and with those of the greater gods Brahmā, Indra, and Mārā, and of the Bodhisattvas, all of whom are, as he remarks, undistinguishable from each other in costume as a rule, so much so, indeed, that the resemblance has been a great stumbling-block in the way of the correct attribution of the sculptures. M. Foucher's remarks on this point (pp. 209, 210) with respect to possible identifications of detached figures of Brahmā and Indra deserve careful attention.

All students of Buddhist iconography must have looked forward to some authoritative pronouncement from

M. Foucher on the subject of the images of the Bodhisattvas in Gandhāra art. Are we or are we not to look for the first appearances of the multifarious forms which are found in mediaeval or modern Buddhism? But M. Foucher finds it still impossible to attain any certainty on this point. Although materials accumulate from the results of recent excavations they are still insufficient as a basis for a confident attribution. The great mass of the statues of Bodhisattvas must still be referred to the real historical prince Siddhārtha, and a large proportion of the vase-bearing figures may, with approximate certainty, be given the name of Maitrēya. Possibly a first adumbration of Avalokitēśvara Padmapāṇi may be found in those figures where a lotus take the place of a water-vase; the late Sahr-i-Bahlōl figure with a figure of Buddha in the head-dress suggests Avalokitēśvara with Amitābha, but the figure is not that of Amitābha but of a teaching Buddha; there is, in fact, a profusion of variations from which new species may in time have been developed, but no chain of descent is established on the evidence we have before us so far. The identity of the figures with long hair in the Brāhman fashion and holding a water-vase with Maitrēya must, however, be considered as fully established.

In the first part of ch. xiii the various numerous appearances of Brāhman ascetics come under consideration, and space does not permit of a full treatment of this subject, on which M. Foucher sheds much light. The identifications of the five principal disciples of Buddha, Sāriputra, Maudgalyāyana, Mahākāśyapa, Vatkula, and Ānanda, can only be alluded to in passing. There is one scene, however, which deserves a fuller mention (fig. 443, from the British Museum collection), in which M. Foucher finds a representation of the acceptance by Buddha, on the mediation of Ānanda, of his aunt Mahāprajāpatī and her companions as candidates for the foundation of an order of nuns. The resemblance of this scene to that of

the donation of Āmrapāli (fig. 244, vol. i) is very strong, and we are tempted to consider that it is rather that event than the acceptance of Mahāprajāpatī which it represents. The principal objection to M. Foucher's identification seems to be that according to the texts the ladies making the request had already donned the monastic habit, while here they appear in the ordinary lay dress of women. M. Foucher thinks this objection insufficient, considering that the artist may refer to an interposition of Ānanda before the final scene, or else that, on artistic grounds, he preferred to balance the appearance of the monks on one side by the ladies in lay attire on the other, as the contrast would not have been sufficiently striking had they been attired like the monks. There is, however, another objection worth considering, viz. that the scene evidently denotes a donation of some kind. The lady who leads the party does not, it is true, present a ewer as in many such scenes, as M. Foucher has shown already (vol. i, p. 487). But she holds in her hand another object, a long bag, which bears a strong resemblance to those still in use in India and known by the Persian name of *khariṭa*. These are made of brocaded silk and are used for the presentation of addresses or valuable documents to great men. Does not this suggest the offering of a conveyance or title-deed to some estate? We may be permitted to reserve our judgment on this point.

The relief which follows this (fig. 444) is an undoubted representation of a very interesting event, the *parinirvāṇa* of Ānanda. Here there can be no doubt as to the scene in question, which, as M. Foucher remarks, is the only exception to the general rule of Gandhāra sculpture, viz. that no events outside the legendary career of Buddha himself are illustrated.

In the second part of ch. xiii M. Foucher deals with the type of the figures of Buddha which are the distinguishing feature of the art of Gandhāra. With a great wealth of

illustration he shows that the artists had to fill a gap which the purely Indian school had not dared to fill, to provide a figure which should comply with the dictates of Hellenistic art without violently offending the prejudices of their clients. To meet this difficulty they selected the well-known type of *Āpollo*, and in the earliest specimens of the work of this school they adhered to it very closely. The great difficulty must have been in the treatment of the hair, and M. Foucher shows how the ancient tradition that Buddha's head was shaved like that of the monks was evaded and the wavy-haired type of an *Apollo* adopted. The only distinctive points of the ancient tradition which were preserved were the *ūrṇa* on the forehead and the elongated ears of the Indian ascetic. The *uṣṇīṣa* receives special treatment, and M. Foucher's convincing argument throws a new light on this difficult subject. It may be briefly stated thus. The original term denoted not a protuberance in the skull but a head-dress such as was worn by royal personages; it was not peculiar to Buddhism, as M. Senart has already noted. Prince Siddhārtha at the time of his renunciation removed his *uṣṇīṣa* with his other tokens of royalty. The epithet *uṣṇīṣa-śīrṣa* applied to all children born to future greatness. It is shown as worn by the Bodhisattva in nearly all the statues, and after its removal the artists show him with shorter hair than that worn by the Bodhisattvas, and that hair gathered into a knot at the top of the head. This is not peculiar to Buddha; it appears also on his half-brother Nanda as he appears in the Hadda relief in the British Museum (fig. 234, vol. i). Up till now the treatment was purely naturalistic, but M. Foucher goes on to consider the transformation which took place in the later period of Gandhāra sculpture, and became stereotyped in subsequent styles, that is, the replacement of the *Apollo*-like waves of hair by a crop of short round curls, which have suggested to some writers the idea of

a negro origin. This is explained as the result of a compromise between Greek art and Indian sentiment, to meet which, while the shaven head was still avoided, "the short curls all turning to the right" (the second of the thirty-two birth signs) were adopted; an absurd result, as M. Foucher observes, for hair in this form, "while natural to a new-born child," is unnatural in an adult, and has led to the "negro" theory. The development of the doctrine of the *uṣṇṣa* and the application of the term to a supposed bony excrescence on the head, a sign of supernatural wisdom, shows a similar attempt to reconcile the recognized forms of sculpture with the doctrines of the textbooks.

In ch. xiv M. Foucher sums up his views on the technique of the sculptures and also on the wider question of their bearing on the history and after-developments of Buddhism. He comes definitely to the conclusion—contrary as he states (p. 373) to his earlier views expressed in 1894—that the beginnings of the Mahāyāna school cannot be traced in the Gandhāra sculptures, with the possible exception of a few very late examples, but yet that the mere existence of these sculptures with their infinite variety, still fluid and unfixed, has had a great influence on the development of that school. This is, indeed, what we are led more and more to believe from a wide consideration of the meaning and tendency of these sculptures as a whole. What we have is all capable of explanation by the doctrines of the old school. The vast hierarchy of Dhyāni-Buddhas and other categories too numerous to mention does not exist as far as Gandhāra sculpture is concerned, nor can any Bodhisattvas, apart from Siddhārtha himself, be recognized with the exception of the future Buddha Maitrēya.

On the other hand, the historical value of these sculptures becomes more and more evident as the available stock is added to by the acquisitions from



recent excavations. The popular and pictorial element in the reliefs throws a flood of light on life in north-west India at the beginning of our era, and on the customs and beliefs of the people. No one has done so much as M. Foucher to explain and illuminate this phase of the subject. The small heads in terra-cotta or stucco, of which specimens are found on pp. 17-21, 97, and 99, are given a fuller treatment than they have hitherto received. Some of these are realistic portraits and others are grotesque, and as a whole they exhibit a feature in Gandhāra art which has not been adequately recognized. Mention must also be made of the plates of coins (pls. iii, iv, and v), which bring together the most important numismatic evidence bearing on the subject of identifications of deities represented in Gandhāra art as found on the coins of the Greek, Saka, Parthian, and Kuṣāṇ kings. Among other identifications it may be mentioned that in the coin of Azilises representing, as has been generally supposed, the *abhiṣēka* of Lakshmi, M. Foucher finds Māyā and the bathing of the invisible Buddha at his birth by two Nāgas. The resemblance to the scene from the north gate of the Great Stupa at Sāñchi reproduced in fig. 474 (see also Sir J. Marshall's *Guide to Sāñchi*, p. 42) is certainly remarkable. In the figures on the square copper coins of Pantaleon and Agathokles, hitherto described as "dancing girls", and in the similar figure on a copper coin of Azes (hitherto supposed to be Lakshmi), he also finds Māyā in the nativity scene. The identifications of the "tutelary pair" on coins have already been alluded to.

In the second part of this volume we may expect, from indications given in the part now published, that M. Foucher will deal with the influence of the Gandhāra school in later art, whether in Central Asia, Mathurā and Sārnāth, Amrāwatī, or still further off in distant Java. To this all students of the subject will look forward, and meanwhile

will recognize that they have in the present volume sufficient to afford them food for thought for some time to come.

M. LONGWORTH DAMES.

---

# THE INTERNATIONAL RELATIONS OF THE CHINESE EMPIRE.

In two volumes. By HOSEA BALLON MORSE, author of *The Trade and Administration of China*, etc. Longmans, Green & Co.

These two admirable volumes, labelled respectively *The Period of Submission, 1861-1893*; and *The Period of Subjection, 1894-1911*, are the complement of *The Period of Conflict, 1834-1860*, which last-named volume was reviewed with deference and gratitude in the Anglo-Russian Society's Journal and in the *Asiatic Quarterly Review*, both of April, 1911. The space now at the disposal of the reviewer will only permit of his noticing *The Period of Submission* in this number, but he trusts to be permitted to make an examination of *The Period of Subjection* in the next. A considerable part of the material worked up by Mr. Morse in the above three volumes had already appeared in a different setting in *The Trade and Administration of the Chinese Empire*, issued by the same publishers in 1908, and reviewed in the *Economic Journal* for June in that year, in the *Manchester Guardian* for May or June, and in the *Asiatic Quarterly Review* for July—all more or less anonymously—by the same admirer of Mr. Morse and his methods. A second edition was reviewed in the *Asiatic Quarterly Review* for July, 1913. It may be said without exaggeration that the general reader, and indeed also the specialist in the Far East, once provided with these four volumes, may consider himself furnished with an unfailing *vade mecum* and encyclopædia in all essential matters connected with Chinese trade, foreign

diplomacy, Consular administration, Customs methods, and international competition. A striking feature in the particular volume now under review—every line of which has been carefully studied by the present writer, and, as far as possible, checked—is the persistency with which the laborious author furnishes original evidence for each statement of fact or opinion, however small. This method necessarily involves innumerable footnotes, with numbered references to each note; it somewhat interferes with the readability, neat arrangement of type, and ready flow of the general narrative, but it unquestionably gives confidence and strengthens the memory of the reader. In a general way this second volume (and perhaps we shall find also the next) is an apotheosis of Sir Robert Hart, whose one lifelong strong feeling was patience and sympathy with the Chinese people, coupled with a passionate and at the same time a calm and reasonable desire to secure for them justice and toleration: no one, indeed, who has lived long and intimately among the Chinese can deny that, despite their many faults, they are a “fine people”—a favourite expression of Sir Robert Hart—and one deserving of great toleration, besides being sure of “a future” in the end.

Although during his final spell there of twenty consecutive years Sir Robert lived like a “joss” in the seclusion of Peking, and exercised, very very quietly, almost autocratic powers, he was remarkably free in his private correspondence, which, in fact, with his violin, must have been a much-needed and cherished relaxation: he was accessible by letter, and very catholic in his choice of correspondents; but his special “selections” seem to have been a number of exceptionally able, loyal, trusted, and prudent Commissioners, such as Hannen, Cartwright, Drew, Bowra, Kopsch, and—up to a certain point and date—Detring. During a residence of two years and a half at Peking, the present writer only saw

his face twice, dining at his house quite formally as an obscure consular junior on December 9, 1871; the next meeting was nearly forty years later, at a Manchester public dinner given in his honour about a year and nine months before his death in September, 1911: yet he frequently corresponded, spontaneously unbosoming himself, in a political sense, during the Peking Legation siege of 1900, the sole "cool" bond between the correspondents being sympathy with the Chinese in their extra-territorial quandaries.

The first chapter in the volume now under review gives us a very complete and exact history of the earliest Customs arrangements at Shanghai, and compares these arrangements with those previously existing under the Co-hong system at Canton. The second chapter tells us how the first Inspectors of Customs were generated from the chaos caused by skippers' evasions and the Taiping rebel investment of Shanghai; how Mr. H. N. Lay did excellent pioneer work, was temporarily succeeded by Mr. Robert Hart, came to grief over the Sherard-Osborn fleet dispute, and was finally, but not ungenerously, dismissed from his post. In reviewing *The Period of Conflict* the present critic remarked, touching Mr. Morse's moderation in judging others, that "perhaps the single instance in which he even goes so far as personally to censure an individual is in the case of Mr. Horatio Nelson Lay": in the present volume, too, Mr. Lay comes in for exceptionally severe judgment, though Mr. Morse could not possibly have come across him in the flesh and thus harboured personal feeling, as Lay left China for good ten years before Mr. Morse arrived: there is no trace in this volume of Mr. Hart's corresponding severity towards his predecessor's memory.

The story of the Palace *coup d'état* of 1861 is well and completely told in ch. iii. It is (it may be here remarked)

thanks to the Prince of Yi's guilty part in it that we happily possess the justly celebrated "Dr. Bushell's Bowl" now in the Victoria and Albert Museum. The Prince of Yi's ancestor had done good yeoman service two centuries before, and no doubt the ancient bowl was bestowed, amongst other heirlooms, upon the first Prince of Yi by the Emperor K'ang-hi in recognition of these important military and political services. The sixth prince of the line had to strangle himself in 1861, and his property was confiscated and put up for sale. In 1907 the late Viceroy, Twanfang, told the writer (in writing) that he had actually seen the bowl so exposed in Peking, and was convinced of its genuineness as one of the oldest and longest specimens in existence of ancient Chinese script (590 B.C.). Next come a couple of chapters upon the suppression of the Taiping rebellion, the true story of the American "adventurers" Ward and Burgevine—both of them, it seems, on the whole very decent fellows after all—the triumphs of Gordon, his quarrels with Li Hung-chang, and so on. Chapter vi treats of the comparatively successful "Co-operative Policy" inaugurated by the "Four B's", to wit, the first resident envoys, Bruce, Burlingame, Berthemy, and Balluseck. Chapter vii is chiefly devoted to Mr. Hart's influence and personality, working in harmony with Sir Frederick Bruce and Mr. Anson Burlingame. His masterly memorandum defending China's attitude towards tonnage dues (Appendix B) displays the forensic ability of a first-class K.C. Chapter viii discusses most carefully all points connected with Chinese emigration, the evils of contract labour, especially in Peru and Cuba, the advantages and disadvantages of free migration to California and Australia, the horrors of the Macao barracoons, and so on. From chapter ix it would appear that Mr. Hart entertained from the outset doubts as to the calm capacity of Mr. Burlingame, when left alone, to turn his surprise

mission—really engineered by Mr. Hart himself—to China's best advantage: it was a comparative failure, and undoubtedly the sanguine missionary enthusiasm of the oratorical mission-chief distantly suggests the methods of a diplomatic "bounder". Chapter x treats of the heart-breaking failures—extending ultimately to over thirty years—to secure a reasonable set of Treaty Revisions. Chapter xi deals with missionaries, towards all of whom Sir Robert Hart's personal attitude was from the first benevolent, friendly, and charitable: though himself by no means a stern moralist, and scarcely an assiduous formalist in external matters of religion—and indeed, with 6,000 or 7,000 missionaries, there are endless varieties to choose from in China—Sir Robert left the general impression of being a sincere and respectful believer. The Tientsin massacre forms the subject of chapter xii, which places many official things in a true light and distributes blame justly; the settlement was, however, complicated and emasculated by the outbreak of war between France and Germany just at that time. The territorial *descensus Averni* of China began with the Loochoo and Formosa affairs described in chapter xiii, where Sir Harry Parkes and Sir Thomas Wade between them did good service in rescuing Japan, as well as China, from an uncommonly awkward position. The next four chapters describe events in which neither Great Britain nor Russia nor France exhibits any excessive itching to do reasonable justice to bewildered China, provocative though her makeshift "diplomacy" may have nearly always been. Sir Thomas Wade was sometimes undignified, though at last successful, over the Chefoo Convention consequent upon Margary's murder; the Page case and the Logan case at Canton were very irritating to Sir Robert Hart; the Russians were tortuous and had to "climb down" over the Ili question; and the French burnt their fingers and were not particularly fair or even dignified about

Tonquin; nor were the Portuguese at all "nice" about the status of Macao. In all these matters, however, the hidden hand was at work, and Prince Kung's *oo-mén-ti Hé* ("our Hart") in his quiet way at Peking did miracles of service in China's interest, in no case more so than in the miserable Fournier Memorandum squabble, culminating in the Paris settlement arranged over all the blundering Peking diplomatists' heads. The Page case is one of the very few instances in Sir Robert's career where he seems to have visibly acted slightly under the influence of temper by clearing every Britisher out of the Canton Customs. The eighteenth chapter describes the much advertised Blockade of Hong-Kong, which was at last solved, chiefly by Sir Robert Hart, in a reasonable way, the foreign commissioners of Chinese Customs being (as Lord Palmerston had from the first been willing) tacitly allowed to reside in Hong-Kong itself. After the shock of the destructive though somewhat futile and trumpery French hostilities, China basked in ten years' sunshine of peace and quiet development, and for a time she enjoyed also England's political support in Corea. But unfortunately Jeshurun waxed fat and haughty, especially in view of her Tonquin, Ili, and Port Hamilton "successes". The death of Sir Harry Parkes (who, however, is scarcely mentioned by Mr. Morse) deprived the Peking diplomatic body of a master hand; hostilities to missionary enterprise became general; the Marquess Tsêng, in London, became rather "cocky"; the Indian Government got its free hand in Bhamo; Yüan Shī-k'ai also assumed a "cocky" attitude in Corea; and, in short, China was heading full-blast for the Japanese war, and received what in Lancashire is called her "cradant blow", Peking "diplomacy" meanwhile looking on in a hopeless flounder. This brings us to the end of the *Period of Submission*; the *Period of Subjection*, from 1894 to the fall of the dynasty in 1911, must be separately examined.

As was said of Mr. Morse's previous works, there are exceptionally few errors in type, and still fewer lapses in statements of fact: "enfored" for "enforced" (p. 20), "magalomanie" (p. 38), "foreign" (p. 209) are among a few printer's slips which might be remedied in a "second impression". The various allusions to Loochoo, Nepaul, and Burma tribute all seem to be a little imperfect. Yi-sin (p. 53) should be Yi-hin, and Tsêng Kwoh-tsueh (p. 110) should certainly be—according to Mr. Morse's system of spelling, which omits all aspirates—Tsêng Kwoh-chüan (p. 356 and Index). Sir R. G. McDowell (p. 210) should be Macdonnell; and (p. 207) the "Manchu Wutang" (who worked his way up from a magistracy to be Viceroy) was a Chinese, family Wu, official name *T'ang*. The writer knew "Monsieur E. de Champs" (pp. 189, 193) very well; but in 1870 he always wrote his name *Deschamps*, in one word. When the next volume is reviewed a list of *coquilles*, etc., in both volumes will be at the publishers' disposal if desired.

The Index is decidedly a good one, and a liberal; but of course a discussion of it properly belongs to vol. iii, where it is found. Mr. Morse evidently did not make it himself; the writer has found on repeated occasions that it takes almost as much time to make and correct a thoroughgoing index as to write its book. The (evidently commissioned) index-maker has, in Mr. Morse's case, left out dozens of names to which frequent cross-reference would be a convenience; for instance, *de Champs* or *Deschamps*, *McDowell* or *Macdonnell*, *Milkiewicz*, *Nepaul*, *Palmerston*, *Sir John Walsham*, etc., etc.; no one not intimately conversant with the whole matter of a book can possibly make an index so satisfactorily as the author thereof. The portrait of Sir Robert Hart (p. 144) was evidently—as we are told, indeed—taken in the sixties, as it shows a much younger and less mature man—not to mention the Dundreary trousers—than went



about Peking in 1871. The picture of Tsêng Kwoh-fan (p. 208) is indeed a rarity: as stated by Mr. Morse, it is a photograph taken from a family picture in the possession of his son, formerly known in London as the Marquess Tsêng (now deceased): the published letters of the senior marquess were translated (*China Review*, xviii, 347-65) by the present writer and at once noticed in the *Times* of 1890; they throw a remarkable light upon the real character of this distinguished man. Mr. Morse does not discuss the missionary question in this volume, apart, that is to say, from noticing specific events and their influence upon international relations; nor does he discuss the opium question from a general point of view: possibly, when we come to his third volume we shall find he has more to say on the "morality" of these two subjects as leading up to the revolution. Meanwhile, no State Department, no learned society connected with trade or geography, no missionary headquarters, no great mercantile or banking establishment should be without its Morse—the whole four volumes if possible.

E. H. PARKER.

---

LES BASES CONVENTIONNELLES DES RELATIONS MODERNES  
ENTRE LA CHINE ET LA RUSSIE. By HOO CHI-TSAI,  
Docteur en Droit, Diplômé de l'École Libre des  
Sciences Politiques. With Preface by M. HENRI  
CORDIER, Membre de l'Institut, and Map of the  
Chino-Russian frontier. Paris: Jouve & Cie. 1918.  
Fr. 17.50.

The international relations between China and Russia fall naturally under two parts, the ancient and the modern. The former comprises the period when these relations were unaffected by outside influences, that is, prior to the treaties of Tientsin (1858) and of Peking (1860), by which the Powers of Western Europe and the

United States obtained the right to appoint representatives at the Court of Peking; and the latter extending from that date to the present day, that is, the period during which those relations have been largely influenced by the ever-increasing intervention in Chinese affairs, first, of the latter Powers and, later, of Japan as well. The section of Modern relations may be appropriately subdivided into three periods; the first extending from the middle of the nineteenth century to the outbreak of the Chino-Japanese war in 1894, the second ending with the Russo-Japanese war, and the third beginning with the Portsmouth Treaty (1905). It is with the first of these three later periods that Mr. Hoo Chi-tsai deals. But as it is necessary to define what the international relations existing between China and Russia at the opening of this period, the middle of the nineteenth century, exactly were, our author passes in review the stipulations of the earlier conventions on which those relations were based, the treaties of Nerchinsk (1689), of Kiachta (1727), and of Kuldja (1851).

The work is thus a review, and a most detailed review, of the relations between China and Russia from the earliest treaty days down to the year 1894. The great outstanding feature of this review is the fact, unique in history, that relations between two such great empires—alas! no longer empires—during a period of more than two centuries have never once been disturbed by war. Both peoples, the Chinese and Russian alike, are by nature of a peace-loving disposition; but examination of the conventions arranged between them shows that if a rupture of relations was avoided, this fact must largely be attributed to either the ignorance or the weakness of the Chinese rulers and negotiators, for every convention concedes some advantage to Russia, while China at no time gains anything.

To those conversant with Chinese affairs, the terms of

the treaties of Tientsin (1858) and of Peking (1860), as well as of those of later date, are well known; and as the two mentioned placed the relations of China with Russia on an entirely new footing, those of earlier date have only a historical value, and are in consequence seldom consulted. Yet they are not devoid of interest.

Thus in the Manchu (the original) text of the Kiachta treaty Russia, which had been designated in the earlier Nerchinsk treaty as "the Empire of Moscovie", is spoken of as "the Empire of the Oros", which becomes in the Chinese "O-lo-sze", the name by which Russia is known in China to the present day; and M. Cordier in the Preface reminds us that this is the name by which the Mongols knew the people north of the Caucasus when, under the leadership of General Subutai, they invaded that country in 1223.

Article 9 of the same treaty recognizes the right of either nation to dispatch missions to the other, and on a footing of mutual equality—"les dispositions s'appliquant aux uns s'appliquent aux autres". And our author suggests that this admission of equality at so early a date goes a long way toward refuting the charge so often brought against China that foreign embassies to that country were regarded as bearers of tribute to a suzerain. Further, as regards the ceremony of the *k'o-t'ow*, he points out (p. 39) that when the first Chinese embassy to the Turguts of the Volga was received in audience in Moscow by the Russian Empress in January, 1714, the Chinese Ambassadors performed this ceremony of their own accord. Further, in May, 1732, the members of another embassy to Russia, on the occasion of their reception at St. Petersburg by the Empress Ianovna, knelt before Her Majesty. "Il est évident que les Ambassadeurs chinois en exécutant le *k'o-t'ou* ne songeaient nullement à reconnaître la suzeraineté de la Russie ni à humilier l'Empereur de Chine. Aux yeux

des Chinois, cette cérémonie n'était qu'une marque de déférence due à la personne du souverain."

When describing the advance of the Allied forces on Peking in 1860, our author says (p. 278): "En même temps, les Chinois rendirent les prisonniers de T'ong-tcheou, qui étaient dans un état lamentable et dont la moitié étaient morts. Les Anglais, pour les venger, incendièrent le Palais d'Été le 18 Octobre. Nous nous empressons d'ajouter à l'honneur des Français qu'ils refusèrent de participer à cette œuvre de destruction."

The prisoners here referred to were a body of *parlementaires* (twenty-five English and fifteen French with an escort of Sikhs) proceeding under a flag of truce to discuss terms with certain Chinese officials, whom on September 18 the Chinese had treacherously seized near T'ungchow, though they were fully aware of the obligations of a flag of truce, inasmuch as they had already often availed themselves of its privileges. Of these, nineteen—mostly in a pitiful condition and the sole survivors of the party—were allowed in the second week of October to make their way to the British camp on the plain north of Peking. The others had succumbed in the park of Yüan-ming Yüan (the Summer Palace) to the frightful tortures to which they had been subjected, resulting from exposure to the fierce sun while bound with cords which, tightened by having water poured over them, had eaten into their flesh. Their confined bodies were all brought into camp within the next few days, and on the 16th were buried with impressive ceremony in the Russian cemetery. The British Ambassador (Lord Elgin) felt strongly that such base treachery and such barbarous inhumanity merited a more severe and more personal punishment than a mere pecuniary fine, and that that punishment should fall, not on the people or the soldiery but, on him who was directly responsible, the Emperor. And what punishment

could be more appropriate than the destruction of the palace at the very doors of which the prisoners had been subjected to their severest tortures? Moreover, as the priceless collection of objects illustrating Chinese crafts, art, and literature, which the palace had previously contained, had been looted before the arrival of British troops in the neighbourhood, "the army would go there," as Lord Elgin says in his *Letters and Journals* (p. 366), "not to pillage, but to mark by a solemn act of retribution, the horror and indignation with which we were inspired by the perpetration of a great crime." Any one interested in the earlier looting and the later destruction of the Summer Palace will find full details of both in Wells Williams, *The Middle Kingdom*, ii, 681 et seq.

ALFRED E. HIPPISELY.

---

SOME ASPECTS OF ANCIENT ARABIC POETRY, AS ILLUSTRATED BY A LITTLE-KNOWN ANTHOLOGY. By Sir CHARLES J. LYALL, K.C.S.I., D.Litt. Published for the British Academy by H. Milford, Oxford University Press, Amen Corner. 1s. 6d. net.

Sir Charles Lyall's lecture, delivered before the British Academy on May 22 of last year, gives his readers a foretaste of the pleasure they may expect to derive from the author's edition of the text of the *Mufaḍḍaliyāt* according to the recension of al-Anbārī, accompanied by an English translation of the poems and notes, which the cutting off of communication during the war with Beyrout, in which city the edition was being printed, has delayed for over three years. We are glad to learn that the printing is now being completed in Cairo, and that the issue of the volumes will not be long postponed.

The "Ancient Arabic Poetry" with which the lecturer deals does not go back farther than the century preceding the mission of Muhammad, or the sixth century of our era,

but these poems assume the existence of an already formed standard of poetry, with established metres and laws of verse belonging to an earlier date. The author points out that there existed a form of language common to the poets or what he calls "a dialect of literature" uniform throughout Central and Northern Arabia, which was only departed from in one group of tribes scattered about the mountainous tract in the centre of the northern half, called the Mountains of Ṭayyī'. This bears testimony to the age of the poetic art of the Peninsula.

As examples of a larger class, Sir Charles Lyall gives translations of poems addressed to the camel and the ostrich, full of swift oriental imagery, and a group of poems bewailing the departure of youth and sight and the on-coming of old age, celebrating the beauty of a maiden, or describing a poet's funeral, as foreseen by himself. They form portions of the *Mufaḍḍaliyāt*, an anthology of poems compiled about the middle of the second century of the Hijrah by al-Mufaḍḍal, a member of the tribe of Dabbah. Until 1885 this collection was practically unknown to European scholars. In that year the late Professor Heinrich Thorbecke published portions of the work, but in spite of this and other attempts to make this important collection of Arabic poetry known, the complete edition, with the commentary of al-Anbārī, will for the first time receive adequate handling when Sir Charles Lyall's work appears. This, fortunately, cannot now be much longer delayed.

E. H.

---

JEWISH MYSTICISM. By JOSHUA ABELSON, Principal of  
Aria College, Portsmouth. London, 1918.

This little reprint of a popular account of mystic religion among the Jews will be very welcome to those who know the author's larger works and have profited

by them, his *Immanence of God* and *Muimionides*. He calls notice to "modern conditions, unfavorable to the cultivation of quietude and introspection", but believes that the "mystical spirit is alive in many a Jewish poet and theologian to-day". It is much to be hoped that in these material days this capacity will never be lost.

F. W. BUSSELL.

SOUTH INDIAN INSCRIPTIONS. Vol. II, Part V: PALLAVA COPPER-PLATE GRANTS FROM VELURPALAYAM AND TANDANTOTTAM. Edited and translated by RAO SAHIB H. KRISHNA SASTRI, B.A. Fol. Madras, 1917.

The Velurpalaiyam plates edited in this part are a Sanskrit and Tamil record of the reign of the Pallava king Vijaya-Nandivarman III, and though it contains little new information it enables us to revise in some degree our previous knowledge of the Pallava dynasty. The Tandantottam plates, likewise Sanskrit and Tamil, are dated in the reign of a Pallava king Vijaya-Nandivikramavarman, who is possibly the same as the Vijaya-Nandivarman of the previous record, and is clearly of the same period. Then come the index to the whole volume and a preface by the lamented Rai Bahadur V. Venkayya, who with his usual wealth of learning traces the history of the great Chōla Rājarāja I and his public works as evidenced in his buildings and inscriptions. *Finis coronat opus*.

L. D. B.

ARCHÆOLOGICAL SURVEY OF INDIA: ANNUAL REPORT, 1915-16. Fol. Calcutta, 1917-18.

We have here two volumes, part i containing Sir John Marshall's general survey of the progress made by his Department in the year 1915-16 and the other volume

giving in a series of papers detailed accounts of the most important of these investigations. In the first of these we may call attention in particular to Sir John Marshall's summary of his extremely important excavations of the ancient Taxila and Dr. Spooner's report on his examination of the sites of the ancient Buddhist university-town of Nālandā, where preliminary operations have brought to light some promising buildings, apparently of about the sixth century A.D., and of the Maurya capital Pāṭaliputra, where some noteworthy antiquities have been discovered. In the other volume Sir John Marshall describes in detail the operations conducted by him, in continuation of his previous work, in the Taxila area on the Dharmarājikā stūpa, the Kunāla monastery, and the cities under the modern Sirkap and Sirsukh, as well as a new site in the same neighbourhood at Moṛa Morādu, where a stūpa and monastery have been opened up, which are for the most part in excellent preservation and contain some remarkably fine frescoes and other antiquities. Mr. H. Hargreaves contributes a report on the monolithic Śaiva temple at Masrur, in the Kangra District. This is a peculiarly interesting building, as only three other sets of free standing monolithic temples have been surveyed in India, and one only of these, that of Dhamnar, is in the Indo-Aryan style. The Masrur temple is far superior to that of Dhamnar, and appears to have been constructed about the eighth century A.D. or a little later. Rai Sahib Daya Ram Sahni in his report on pre-Muhammadan monuments of Kashmir gives the result of his valuable surveys of a number of important ancient buildings, which have hitherto been imperfectly studied. Mr. C. Duroiselle writes on "The Art of Burma and Tantric Buddhism", announcing the discovery of some remarkable frescoes at the temples of Min-nan-thu near Pagan and of an inscription near them, which throw much light on the nature of the mysterious sect of Aris. It seems now clear that the Aris



were an offshoot of Northern Buddhism and came to Pagan about the sixth century A.D. from Bengal or Northern India, and there catered to local superstitions by acting as priests to the cults of serpents and spirits and practising bloody rites of sacrifice; about the eighth century they were deeply tainted with the sexual immorality and witchcraft of the Tāntrikas; and in the eleventh century, though persecuted by Anorata, they were not exterminated by him, but were only scattered. Their unclean rites and sacrifices were stopped by the reforms of Dhammacheti (fifteenth century) and Sinbyushin (sixteenth century), but they survived as free-living communities under the name of "boxing monks" as late as the eighteenth century, and possibly certain immoral practices of the modern Shan monks may be derived from them. Space forbids us to notice the minor papers of this most interesting volume.

L. D. B.

- 
1. ANNUAL REPORT OF THE ARCHÆOLOGICAL SURVEY OF INDIA, EASTERN CIRCLE, FOR 1916-17. Calcutta, 1918. Fol.
  2. ANNUAL PROGRESS REPORT OF THE SUPERINTENDENT, HINDU AND BUDDHIST MONUMENTS, NORTHERN CIRCLE, FOR THE YEAR ENDING MARCH 31, 1917. Lahore, 1917. Fol.

Both these reports chronicle satisfactory progress, though they have no sensational novelties to announce. The first of them comprises Dr. Spooner's General Remarks, and as appendices the reports of the Assistant Superintendents; and our readers will be pleased to learn that the excavations at Nālandā, which have been mainly supported by the fund contributed by the Royal Asiatic Society, have made good progress, showing the existence of four monasteries successively erected one over the other

on the main site, and yielding large quantities of antiquities. The second contains Mr. Daya Ram Sahni's survey of the year's work of his department, with a list of inscriptions copied, mostly short records of donations of an early date. The announcement of the discovery of some half-dozen tablets in the peculiar unknown script of Harappa is interesting and promising, and we hope that the site will be thoroughly examined.

L. D. B.

---

LE SVASTIKA. Son histoire; ses significations; son existence et ses déformations au Pays Basque; cultes qui s'y rattachent. By Dr. RÉNÉ CROSTE. Extrait du Bulletin Trimestriel de la Société Bayonnaise d'Études Régionales. Bayonne, 1918.

This short paper by Dr. Croste gives some interesting details concerning the use of the swastika by the Basques. They place it on tombs and doors and "in villages" (whatever that may mean) and cemeteries. According to the eminent student of Basque, Canon Daranatz, the swastika is most often found on sheep-folds (bergeries) and on the tombs of shepherds and priests. It is to be hoped that the Canon and his fellow-students will try to follow up this clue and track out the reason for this remarkable association, for it is possible that the inquiry may lead to important results. The connection between any social custom—even apparently so trivial as that of the use of a symbol—and a particular social category is always worth attentive study.

Dr. Croste, persuaded that the swastika is a solar symbol and connected with a fire-cult, although knowledge of its meaning is lacking among the Basques, has noted some Basque customs connected with fire. On Easter Eve fresh fire is taken from the church to the

neighbouring houses. The bearer of the fire knocks at the door of each house, which is closed for the occasion, and is only opened when those inside have thrown out of the window the old brazier which till then had lighted the family altar. Another custom persists in certain villages according to which, when a death occurs, the fire which is burning on the hearth at the time is buried at the side of the door.

Dr. Croste in a note on p. 7 mentions the important work of M. Houssay on the swastika, in which the author maintains that it represents the octopus and is a symbol of fertility. In all probability this solution is the correct one, the solar association being the product of a process of syncretism.

W. J. PERRY.

---

SOUTH SLAV MONUMENTS. . I. SERBIAN ORTHODOX CHURCH. Edited by MICHAEL J. PUPIN, Ph.D., etc., Professor of Columbia University, with an Introduction by Sir T. G. JACKSON, Bart., R.A., etc. London: John Murray. 1918.

This is the first instalment of a richly illustrated work, containing photographs (some of them coloured), plans, and descriptions of South Slav buildings and works of art. The eminent English architect, Sir T. G. Jackson, has written an introduction, historical and descriptive, which is followed by a preface by a Serbian architect, Mr. K. J. Jovanović. The monuments represented date from 1000 to 1460 A.D., and the photographs are mainly of buildings, but in part of pictures. The work is a beautiful specimen both of topography and reproduction of photography, and will form a valuable addition to artistic and especially to architectural collections; but its subject is somewhat removed from the studies of this Society.

## OBITUARY NOTICES

---

### PROFESSOR L. H. MILLS

It is a remarkable coincidence that the only two English-speaking scholars who have published original translations into English of the Avestan Gāthās have died within the space of less than ten months of each other. Professor James Hope Moulton, of the University of Manchester, whose tragic death, as the result of the torpedoing of the *City of Paris*, occurred, at the comparatively early age of 54, on April 7, 1917, published, as an appendix to his important work *Early Zoroastrianism* (1913), a fresh translation of those ancient hymns which, though avowedly based on the German version of Bartholomae, still, as he justly claimed himself, is no mere slavish re-translation,<sup>1</sup> but one relying on a keen and intelligent study of the original texts word by word. It is certainly the best and most reliable, as well as the most intelligible, version that we possess. On January 29, 1918, died, after long infirmity and at the ripe old age of 81, Professor Lawrence Heyworth Mills, of Oxford University, whose English version of the Gāthās is contained in his translation of the Avestan *Yasna* (vol. xxxi of SBE.), published in 1887.

From his manner and speech I had always concluded that L. H. Mills was a North of Ireland man, but I learn that he was born in New York in 1837, and received his education at the New York University and at the Fairfax Theological Seminary, Virginia. He held the New York degree of D.D., and in later years was made honorary M.A. of Oxford. I presume that he entered the ecclesiastical ministry in America. It was at the invitation of the late Max Müller that he undertook the formidable task of translating the *Yasna* and

<sup>1</sup> Like Bleek's translation of Spiegel's version.

*Visparad* for the SBE., and so completing the version of the Avesta, the two preceding parts (vols. iv, xxiii, of the series) having been the work of the celebrated French scholar James Darmesteter (1880, 1883), who, it was generally supposed, shirked undertaking so difficult a piece of work, though he afterwards produced his French translation in 1892. Indeed, in his preface to the latter, Darmesteter plainly says: "Je ne pus me résoudre à accepter, ne me trouvant pas suffisamment armé pour cette tâche. Je considérais une traduction de ces deux livres comme impossible à cette date, étant donnée la pénurie des secours dont on disposait alors." In accordance with what was the least amiable trait of his character, Darmesteter apparently passes by in silence the work of his English predecessor.

Mills' translation (pt. iii, *The Yasna, Visparad, Âfrinagân, Gâhs, and Miscellaneous Fragments*) appeared as vol. xxxi of SBE. in 1887.<sup>1</sup> In a quasi-autobiographical article in the ZDMG., vol. lxv, pp. 331 et seq., 1911, Mills gives us his own account of the undertaking and of his views on Avestic exegetics in general. It is far too long to quote, but I select a few sentences.

"It was undertaken at the united request of a leading German, the Editor, and a leading Frenchman, one of the translators. The invitation, an urgent one, to continue the two previous volumes upon the Avesta then already published, was extended upon the basis of my work upon the *Gâthas*, which had been tentatively put into print two years previously, by 1881, or earlier. . . . Since 1881 I had paused before entering upon the commentary, enjoying the very high privilege of closely attending the lectures of the late Professor R. von Roth at Tübingen."

Although thus a pupil of this leader of the "Vedic" school of Avestan scholarship, Mills developed in quite an opposite direction into one of the leading lights of the "traditional" school.

<sup>1</sup> Reviewed in JRAS., N.S., Vol. XIX, p. 700.

His connexion with the SBE led to Mills settling down definitely at Oxford. Ten years later, in 1897, a special chair of "Zend Philology" was created for him in the University by the generosity of Indian and English admirers. He was thus the first and only holder of a professorship of Irānian language and literature in a British University. He continued his astonishingly abundant literary output until 1917.

Mills may, in one sense, be strictly described as *homo unius libri*. In spite of his endless publications, both books and articles, we may say that all he wrote centred around the *Yasna*, containing the Gāthās, to the elucidation of which he devoted practically his whole life. Under date 1894 appeared in Erlangen his bulky volume, *A Study of the Five (Zoroastrian) Gāthās, with Zarathushtrian texts and translations* (xxx + 622 pp.), which has been justly styled "a monumental work". It contains not only the Avestan (Zend) text, with English and Latin renderings, but also the Pahlavi, Sanskrit (Neryosangh's), and Persian versions, also translated into English, with elaborate notes and commentary. This was followed up in 1900 by *The Gāthās of Zarathushtra (Zoroaster) in metre and rhythm* (Leipzig, Brockhaus), and in 1902 by *A Dictionary of the Gāthic Language of the Zend Avesta*, "being vol. iii of *A Study of the Five Gāthās*, etc.," but containing only the letters *u* to *y* (a to ē). It was never completed.

Meantime, in 1893, the Oxford Clarendon Press had issued, under Mills' editorship, the superb collotype facsimile of the MS. of the *Yasna* known as "J. 2", the oldest existing Avestic MS. (A.D. 1323), which had been presented to the Bodleian Library by the Parsi High Priest, Jamaspji Minocheherji, perhaps the most splendid facsimile of an ancient MS. ever published.

But Mills' books represent but a portion of his literary output. He contributed articles in an endless stream to

all the leading Orientalist or philological reviews, notably the JRAS., the ZDMG., the JAOS., the AQR., and the *Muséon* of Louvain, besides half a dozen other periodicals. Most of these articles are critical editions of the Pahlavi texts of the various chapters of the *Yasna*, with translations and commentaries, or collations of all the available texts with their Sanskrit or other equivalents. A large number of others are occupied with such questions as interested Mills as a theologian, notably the relations between the Avesta and the Old Testament, and also with Philo. I had compiled a list occupying several closely written pages, and which, I believe, is far from complete, of these articles; but I find it is too long for publication, and I content myself with a list, at the end, of his articles in this Journal.<sup>1</sup>

It must be honestly said that Mills' erudition, vast indeed in his own sphere, was of what may be called the "cumbrous" type. His translations are so intricate and obscure that it has been said, not unjustly, that you often require the original Avesta text to understand his English. And so immense is the quantity of information congested in his comments, that one may honestly declare that "you cannot see the wood for the trees". Hence his numberless

<sup>1</sup> It may, however, prove useful to Avesta students to have the following list of Yasna papers other than those quoted from this Journal:—

ZDMG.: Pahlavi texts, Yasna X-XIII, 56 (1902), p. 117; Yasna XIV-XVI, 57 (1903), p. 13; Yasna XIX, 12-58, ib. p. 577; Yasna I, ib. p. 766; Yasna XX-XXII, 58 (1904), p. 426; Srōš Yašt, Yasna LV, LVI, 60 (1906), p. 73; Yasna LVIII-LXII, ib. p. 84; Yasna LXV, 61 (1907), p. 370; Yasna LXVI, LXVIII, 62 (1908), p. 555; Yasna LXX, 64 (1910), p. 119; Yasna LXXI, ib. p. 430; Yasna XLIV, 1-10, 65 (1911), p. 65; Yasna XXX, 68 (1914), p. 149.

*Muséon*: Pahlavi texts, Yasna I, n.s., vii (1906), p. 161; Yasna XIII, n.s., v (1904), p. 76; Yasna XXIX, in its Sanskrit equivalent, n.s., xiii (1912), p. 1; Yasna XXXI, in its Sanskrit equivalent, n.s., xv (1914), p. 1.

JAOS.: Pahlavi texts, Yasna IX, 49-103, xxiv, p. 61.

Eleventh Orientalist Congress, Paris, 1897: The Sanskrit Equivalents of Yasna XLIV, t. i, p. 317.

Thirteenth Orientalist Congress, Hamburg, 1902: Pahlavi texts, Yasna XIX (résumé).

contributions to Avestan science must rather serve as mines of information for future scholars to dig in, than as constructive works in the domain of Avestan study. Many of his views, whether philological or exegetical, were peculiar and are not likely to find many adherents. But his erudition and his industry can only be described as prodigious.

Personally I found him a kind and agreeable character, decidedly sore sometimes on the treatment he had received from German Orientalists, who, he believed, plundered whilst criticising him, and endowed with a sense of humour, that not unfrequently appears also in his writings.

L. C. CASARTELLI.

ARTICLES BY L. H. MILLS IN JRAS.

1899. The Initiative of the Avesta. p. 271.  
 1900. The First Preparers of the Haoma. p. 511.  
 1901. Philo's *dyrdmeis* and the Amesha Spenta. p. 553.  
 1902. Zoroaster and Heraclitus. p. 897.  
 1903. The Vision of Haoma to Zarathushtra. p. 313.  
     The Pahlavi Texts of Yasna X. p. 495.  
     Elohē Hašamaīm is Devā. p. 833.  
 1904. The Pahlavi Texts of Yasna XI, XIII. p. 75.  
     "       "       "       XIX. p. 295.  
     "       "       "       I. p. 687.  
 1905.       "       "       "       Haptanghaiti. p. 58.  
     "       "       "       Srōsh Yasht. p. 451.  
     "       "       "       Yasna XIV-XVI, XX, XXI. p. 657.  
 1906.       "       "       "       LVII-LXI. p. 53.  
     "       "       "       LXV. p. 825.  
 1907.       "       "       "       XXII. p. 85.  
     "       "       "       LXVI, LXVIII. p. 583.  
 1908.       "       "       "       LXX. p. 39.  
     "       "       "       LXXI. p. 765.  
 1909.       "       "       "       LXXI (continued). p. 77.  
 1910. *Ahuna Vairya*, from Yasna XXVII. p. 13.  
     "       "       with Pahlavi and Sanskrit translations. pp. 57  
                     and 641.  
 1912. Yasna XXX, as the Document of Dualism. p. 81.  
 1915.       "       XXXII, 1-8, in its Indian equivalent. p. 205.  
 1916.       "       "       9-15       "       "       p. 103.  
 1917.       "       XLIII, 1-6, in its Indian forms. p. 541.  
     "       "       "       7-16       "       "       p. 753.  
 1919.       "       XLVII of Gatha(-a) Spentamainyu. p. 1.



## AUGUSTUS FREDERIC RUDOLF HOERNLE

It is with a sad heart that I claim the privilege of offering tribute to the memory of a great scholar and valued member of this Society. Those of us who have joined with him in the deliberations of our Council, or who have studied his many contributions to our Journal, need no reminder of the wide extent and depth of his learning; but for them, as well as for those whose interests have been in directions other than that in which he gained distinction, it is fitting to place on record an account of his life and of the services that he has rendered to Oriental science.

AUGUSTUS FREDERIC RUDOLF HOERNLE was born on October 19, 1841, at Secundra, near Agra, his father being the Rev. C. T. Hoernle, who, during the greater part of his life, served in India under the Church Missionary Society. He was sent to Europe in 1848, and received his early education in the kingdom of Würtemberg. His university career began at Basle in 1858, and was continued from 1860 in London, where he studied Sanskrit under Goldstücker. He returned to India in 1865, and was appointed Professor of Philosophy at Jay Narayan's College in Benares. While there he became a member of the Asiatic Society of Bengal, and in 1872 there appeared in its Journal from his pen the first of a series of "Essays in aid of a Comparative Grammar of the Gaurian Languages", which at once established his reputation as a philologist. These essays formed the groundwork of the *Comparative Grammar of the North Indian Vernaculars* which he wrote while on leave in England during the years 1873-7, and which was published in 1878 after his return to India. It is unnecessary to dwell upon the excellent qualities of this work or on the admiration that it excited, gaining for it the Volney Prize of the Institut de France. Appearing simultaneously with the later volumes of Beames's

*Comparative Grammar* (1872-9), it was in no sense a rival of the latter. Although both works dealt with the same subject, each author treated it in his own inimitable way. Each book completed and supplemented the other, and each presented the modern Indo-Aryan languages from a different point of view; so that both are still indispensable tools for every student in this field of inquiry.

On his return to India Hoernle became Principal of the Cathedral Mission College in Calcutta, which post he held till 1881, when he entered the Government Educational Service and was appointed Principal of the Calcutta Madrasah. In 1879 he was elected Honorary Philological Secretary of the Asiatic Society of Bengal, a position which included the editing of the philological side of the Society's Journal, and which he held for twelve years. These were the most fruitful of his Indian career. In the Journal and in the Proceedings there appeared numerous articles and shorter notes of which he was the author, mostly dealing with numismatics and epigraphy. Two important works also belong to this period: an edition of Caṇḍa's *Prākṛta-lakṣaṇa* (1880) and an edition and translation of the *Uvāsaga-dasāo*, the seventh Jaina *Āṅga* (1888-90). During the same period many articles by him also appeared in the pages of the *Indian Antiquary*, and, in conjunction with the present writer, there was begun the publication of a Bihārī Dictionary, which, however, press of other duties prevented our continuing after the first two instalments.

In the year 1881 fragments of an old birch-bark manuscript were dug up in the village of Bakhshālī on the North-West Frontier. It gave rise to considerable curiosity, but no one succeeded in reading it till it was sent to Hoernle by the Panjāb Government. He attacked it at once and with striking success. Although it had neither beginning nor end, and consisted merely of

disorganized fragments with not a single leaf complete, he succeeded in deciphering the greater part of it and in showing that it was an ancient arithmetical treatise by an unknown author. Hoernle wrote several articles concerning it, perhaps the best known being the paper read before the Vienna Oriental Congress of 1886, which may be considered to be his finally expressed opinion on a difficult subject. The literary value of the manuscript was not very great, but its decipherment marked out Hoernle as one of the foremost authorities on archaic Indian scripts, and opened the way for much more important work of the kind in future years.

In 1884 the Asiatic Society of Bengal celebrated its centenary, and published a review of its work during the past hundred years. The valuable section of this dealing with Archæology, History, Literature, etc., was written by Hoernle, and to this he added two historical appendixes, both of which were subsequently reprinted, with additions, in the *Indian Antiquary*. In 1891 Hoernle resigned his post of Honorary Secretary, but continued till 1897 to be a member of the Council of the Society with which he had been so long connected, when it conferred upon him the highest honour which it was within its powers to grant by electing him as its President. Finally, in 1899, on the eve of his departure from India, it elected him an Honorary Member, or, as the name became in later years, an Honorary Fellow.

In the year 1890 Lieutenant (now Major-General) H. Bower, C.B., brought to India an ancient birch-bark manuscript which had been discovered by him at Kuchâ in Central Asia. At the time Hoernle was absent in Europe, but on his return in 1891 it was made over to him, and his first decipherment was published in the Proceedings of the Bengal Society for April of that year. It is through his work on this manuscript that Hoernle's name as an Orientalist is best known in Europe.

Numerous essays written by him culminated in the great edition published in parts between 1893 and 1912. This is not the place to give details regarding the results of Hoernle's investigations, and it is sufficient to state in his own words that "the discovery of the Bower manuscript and its publication in Calcutta started the whole modern movement of the archæological exploration of Eastern Turkistan". All scientific Europe set forth on the quest for further antiquities in this region, and more and more materials illustrating an ancient and now dead civilization were gradually placed at the disposal of the learned world. The first to be discovered were more manuscripts. Such were those found by the Russians in 1892, or the Weber and Macartney manuscripts collected through British agency and brought to India. The latter were entrusted to Hoernle, and formed a portion of the subject-matter of his latest work. A direct result of the discoveries of these ancient writings was the triad of memorable expeditions to Central Asia carried out so successfully by Sir Aurel Stein, and other expeditions, such as those for the Russians by Klementz, for the Germans by Grünwedel and von Le Coq, for the Japanese by Otani, and for the French by Pelliot.

The Bower manuscript deals largely with medical subjects, and this compelled Hoernle to study the hitherto almost untouched subjects of Hindū medicine and surgery. Here, again, we reap rich fruits from his investigations in a new branch of research. Besides minor essays he published in 1907 the first of his *Studies in the Medicine of Ancient India*, which deals with Osteology. Here the confused history of the writings of the earliest Indian physicians and surgeons was for the first time placed upon a scientifically sound basis.

The title of C.I.E. was conferred upon him by the Government of India in 1897, and in 1899 he retired from the Indian Educational Service. In the following

year he joined this Society, and, besides contributing many important articles to our Journal, served us both on the Council and as Vice-President. On his return to England he settled with his family in Oxford, where he completed his work on the Bower manuscript and wrote his book on Osteology. A minor product of these days was a small history of India (1904), written in conjunction with Mr. Stark, and a model of lucid compression, embodying the latest scientific discoveries. Here, too, he undertook his last great work, the editing in collaboration with other scholars of the many manuscripts collected in Eastern Turkistan and brought home to England by himself and others. These included the Weber MSS., the Macartney MSS., and selections from the collection brought back by Sir Aurel Stein. The first volume was published in 1916, and only a few days before his death he wrote to me to say that he had just finished preparing for the press the manuscript of the second.

The War has been a tragedy to all of us, but to few was it a deeper tragedy than to Hoernle. English alike by birth and by long associations, he still could not but feel more deeply than most the inevitable sorrows, and these past four years were in some respects the saddest of his life. His great wish was to live until the peace should come, and it is a consolation to his friends to know that in his last hours he heard the cheers in the street heralding the signing of the Armistice and passed away with the knowledge that his longing was fulfilled. He died, after a short illness, in the early hours of November 12, 1918.

In the pages of a scientific journal it is proper that attention should mainly be directed to his literary work; but an old and close friend cannot close these pages without a reference to his personal character. Hoernle had a genius for winning friends. He wrote much, and on much discussed matters, but not even those who were

pronounced in their differences could impart heat or anger to the controversy. As for those who had the privilege of intimacy with him, his kindly personality, sometimes illuminated by a whimsical humour, endeared him to all. Ever courteous, ever modest, he was always ready to listen patiently to those who differed from him, and to point out, without a tinge of offence, where he thought that they were wrong. His profound knowledge of his own subjects, based as it was on almost incredible spadework, gave little chance to hasty theories in opposition to his own, and yet no one was more ready to accept a point that he had overlooked or to place his stores of learning at the disposal of others. Who that has known that happy home in the Madrasah and afterwards in Oxford will not bear me out in this? And the mention of that home, endeared to many old friends by memories that will not easily be effaced, recalls the kindly hostess with whom he shared it, and compels an expression of the profoundest sympathy in the grievous loss that she has sustained.

Hoernle was an Honorary Fellow of the Asiatic Society of Bengal, an Honorary Member of the American Oriental Society and of the Royal Society of Medicine, and a Foreign Associate Member of the Société Asiatique de Paris. As an appendix, I add a list of his writings so far as I have been able to ascertain them.

G. A. GRIERSON.

#### LIST OF THE WRITINGS OF DR. HOERNLE

##### ON INDIAN PHILOLOGY

##### *Sanskrit and Pāli*

Remarks on the Pāli Grammarian Kachchayana. Proc. ASB. 1882, p. 125.

Professor Rāmchandra G. Bhāṇḍārkar and the Gāthā Dialect. *Indian Antiquary*, xii, p. 205, 1883.

On *Ekotiśāhira*. Proc. A.S.B. 1887, p. 175.

*Prakrit*

- Subhā Chandra, author of the *Śabda Chintāmaṇi*. *Indian Antiquary*, ii, p. 29, 1873.
- A New Prakrit Grammar by Chaṇḍa. Proc. ASB. 1878, p. 178.
- On a MS. of the Prakrit Grammar of Vararuchi. Id. 1879, p. 79.
- On a MS. of an Unknown Prakrit Grammar. Id. 1880, p. 101.
- The *Prākṛita-Lakṣhaṇam*, or Chaṇḍa's Grammar of the Ancient (Arsha). Prakrit. Edited. Pt. i, Text with Critical Introduction and Indexes. *Bibliotheca Indica*. Calcutta, 1880.
- The Date of Trivikrama. *Indian Antiquary*, xii, p. 27, 1883.
- See also Jainism.

*Modern Indo-Aryan Languages*

- Essays in aid of a Comparative Grammar of the Gaurian Languages. JASB., pt. i, vol. xli, p. 120, 1872; xlii, p. 59, 1873; xliii, p. 22, 1874.
- On the term Gaurian as a Name for the Sanskrit Vernaculars of North India. Proc. ASB. 1872, p. 177.
- On the Derivation of some peculiar Gaurian Verbs. *Indian Antiquary*, i, 1872, p. 356.
- Genitive Postpositions: in reply to Dr. Pischel. Id. ii, p. 210, 1873.
- Translation of the 27th Canto of the Prithirāja Rāsau of Chānd Bardāi. Id. iii, p. 17, 1874.
- On some Prosodical Peculiarities of Chand. Id. iii, p. 104, 1874.
- The Ka-Theory and Mr. Beames's Comparative Grammar. Id. v, p. 119, 1876.
- A Comparative Grammar of the North Indian Vernaculars [or, in some copies, a C.G. of the Gaudian Languages], with Special Reference to Eastern Hindī. London, 1880.
- A Collection of Hindī Roots, with Remarks on their Derivation and Classification. JASB. xlix, pt. i, p. 53, 1880.
- Note on Bihārī Declension. Id. lii, pt. i, p. 159, 1883.
- The Prithirāj Rāsau, an Old Hindī Epic, commonly ascribed to Chānd Bardāi. Edited and translated by Hoernle. Pt. ii, vol. i, Cantos 26-34. *Bibliotheca Indica*. Calcutta, 1886.
- A Comparative Dictionary of the Bihārī Language. By A. F. Rudolf Hoernle and George A. Grierson. Calcutta. Pt. i, 1885; pt. ii, 1889.

## ON JAINISM

- The *Uvāsagadasāo*—being the Seventh Aṅga of the Jains. *Bibliotheca Indica*. Calcutta. Vol. i, Text and Commentary, 1890; vol. ii, Translation, 1888.
- The *Paṭṭāvali* or List of Pontiffs of the Upakesa-Gachchha. *Indian Antiquary*, xix, p. 233, 1890.
- Two *Paṭṭāvalis* of the Sarasvatī-Gachcha of the Digambara Jains. Id. xx, p. 341, 1891.
- Three further *Paṭṭāvalis* of the Digambaras. Id. xxi, p. 57, 1892.
- See also Proc. ASB. 1898, pp. 39 ff. (a History of Jainism and Buddhism in Hoernle's Presidential Address).

## ON NUMISMATICS AND RELATED SUBJECTS

*(Reports consisting of mere lists are not included.)*

- On Gold Coins found in the Ahin Posh Tope near Jalalabad. *Proc. ASB.* 1879, pp. 122, 210.
- On four Coins presented to the Society by Mr. Growse. *Id.*, p. 173.
- Monograms of the Baktro-Greek King Euthydemus. *Indian Antiquary*, viii, p. 196, 1879.
- On Roman, Indo-Scythian, and Gupta Coins sent by Mr. H. Rivett-Carnac. *Proc. ASB.* 1880, p. 118.
- On Coins belonging to Mr. R. Nicholson. *Id.* 1881, p. 39.
- On Coins of the later Delhi Emperors. *Id.*, p. 40.
- On Coins, etc., from Khokhrakote. *Id.*, p. 71.
- A New Find of Early Muhammadan Coins. *JASB.* 1, pt. i, p. 53, 1881.
- On three Coins found near Mahanad. *Proc. ASB.* 1882, pp. 91, 104.
- On Coins and Clay Figures from Toomluk. *Id.*, p. 111.
- On ten Silver Coins from Chhindwara. *Id.*, p. 114.
- On Coins from Midnapur. *Id.* 1883, p. 59.
- On certain Gold Coins. *Id.*, p. 143.
- A New Find of Muhammadan Coins of Bengal (Independent Period). *JASB.* lii, pt. i, p. 211, 1883.
- On Gold Gupta Coins. *Proc. ASB.* 1884, p. 127; 1885, p. 2.
- On Clay Seals from Sonait. *Id.* 1884, p. 137.
- On Kashmiri Coins. *Id.* 1885, p. 4.
- On an Ornament of Gold Roman Coins found in the Manikyāla Tōp in the District of Rawal Pindi. *Id.* 1886, p. 86.
- On Ancient Copper Coins found in Nepal. *Id.* 1887, p. 144; 1888, p. 114.
- On some new Bactrian and Gupta Coins. *Id.* 1888, p. 126.
- On some new or rare Hindū and Muhammadan Coins. *JASB.*, pt. i, No. i, lviii, p. 30, 1889; No. ii, lix, p. 169, 1890; No. iii, lxii, p. 23, 1893; No. iv, lxvi, p. 133, 1897.
- On an Inscribed Seal of Kumāra Gupta. *Id.* lviii, p. 88, 1889. *Cf. Proc. ASB.* 1889, p. 194.
- On Copper Coins of the Śrī Dynasty. *Id.* lix, pt. i, p. 154, 1890.
- On certain Indo-Sassanian Coins found in Mārward. *Id.* lix, pt. i, p. 168, 1890.
- On a forged Silver Ramtinki. *Proc. ASB.* 1890, p. 7.
- On four Copper Coins of Abdagases and Kādphises II. *Id.* 1895, p. 82.
- Notes on Coins of Native States. *JASB.* lxvi, pt. i, p. 261, 1897.
- Scytho-Bactrian Coins in the British Collection of Central Asian Antiquities. *Indian Antiquary*, xxvii, p. 225, 1898.
- Indo-Chinese Coins in the same. *Id.* xxviii, p. 46, 1899.
- Note on the British Collection of Central Asian Antiquities. *Id.* xxix, pp. 63, 98, 1900.

## EPIGRAPHY, HISTORY, AND RELATED SUBJECTS

- On a Pāli Inscription sent by Mr. A. M. Markham. *Proc. ASB.* 1880, p. 55.
- Notes on a Rock-cut Inscription from Riwā. *Indian Antiquary*, ix, p. 120, 1880.



- On Relics from Buddha Gaya. *Proc. ASB.* 1881, p. 88.  
 Readings from the Bharhut Stūpa. *Indian Antiquary*, x, pp. 118, 255, 1881; xi, p. 25, 1882.  
 Readings from the Arian Pāli. The Sue Vihāra Inscription. *Id.* x, p. 324, 1881.  
 Revised Translations of two Kshatrapa Inscriptions. *Id.* xii, p. 27, 1883.  
 The Gaharwārs and Rāthors. *Centenary Review of the Asiatic Society of Bengal*, 1885, p. 199. Revised and reprinted in *Indian Antiquary*, xiv, p. 98, 1885.  
 The Pālas of Bengal. *Centenary Review of the Asiatic Society of Bengal*, 1885. Reprinted, with revision in *Indian Antiquary*, xiv, p. 162, 1885.  
 Remarks on an Aśoka Inscription at Prabhāsa. *Proc. ASB.* 1887, p. 103.  
 A New Copper-plate Grant of Govinda-chandradeva of Kanauj. *Indian Antiquary*, xix, p. 249, 1890.  
 Note on Mr. W. Irvine's Article on Official Dates of Accession of Mughal Emperors. *JASB.* lxii, pt. i, p. 265, 1893.  
 Note on Mr. V. A. Smith's Paper on History and Coinage of the Gupta Period. *Id.* lxiii, pt. i, p. 210, 1894.  
 Note on the Sōhgaurā Copper-plate. *Proc. ASB.* 1894, p. 87.  
 The Gauhātī Copper-plate Grant of Indrapāla of Prāgyōtiṣa in Āsām. *JASB.* lxvi, pt. i, p. 133, 1897.  
 The Nowgong Copper-plate Grant of Balavarman of Prāgyōtiṣa in Āsām. *Id.*, p. 285.  
 Two Copper-plate Grants of Ratnapāla of Prāgyōtiṣa in Āsām. *Id.* lxvii, pt. i, p. 99, 1898.  
 An Epigraphical Note on Palm-leaf, Paper, and Birch-bark. *Id.* lxix, pt. i, p. 93, 1900.  
 Some Problems of Ancient Indian History.  
     I. Coins of Vikramāditya and Harsha Vardhana. *JRAS.* 1903, p. 545; 1904, p. 357.  
     II. The Gurjara Empire. *Id.* 1904, p. 639.  
     III. The Gurjara Clans. *Id.* 1905, p. 1.  
     IV. Identity of Yaśodharman and Vikramāditya. *Id.* 1909, p. 89; Harshavardhana and Śilāditya. *Id.*, p. 446.  
 Who was the Inventor of Rag-paper? *Id.* 1903, p. 663; 1904, p. 548.  
 A History of India. By A. F. Rudolf Hoernle and Herbert A. Stark. Cuttack, 1904.  
 Kumāragupta the Patron of Vasubandhu. *Indian Antiquary*, xl, p. 181, 1911.  
 Kālidāsa and Kāmandaki. *Id.* xli, p. 184, 1912.

#### ON THE BAKHSHĀLĪ MANUSCRIPT

- On a Birch-bark MS. from Bakhshālī. *Proc. ASB.* 1882, p. 108.  
 Reprinted in *Indian Antiquary*, xii, p. 89, 1883.  
 The Bakhshālī Manuscript. *Indian Antiquary*, xvii, pp. 33, 275, 1888.  
 On the Bakhshālī Manuscript. Proceedings of the Seventh International Congress of Orientalists (Vienna, 1886), Aryan Section, p. 127.

To these may be added :—

G. R. KARE. Note on the Bakhshālī Manuscript. JASB., n.s., viii, p. 349, 1912.

#### ON THE BOWER MANUSCRIPT

The Old Birch MS. from Kashgaria. Proc. ASB. 1891, p. 54.

On the Date of the Bower MS. JASB., vol. lx, pt. i, p. 79, 1891.

An Instalment of the Bower Manuscript. Id., p. 135.

A Note on the Date of the Bower Manuscript. *Indian Antiquary*, vol. xxi, p. 29, 1892.

Another Instalment of the Bower MS. Id., p. 129.

The Third Instalment of the Bower MS. Id., p. 349.

The Bower Manuscript. Vol. xxii of the New Imperial Series of the Archaeological Survey of India. Calcutta, 1893-1912. A reprint of the Introduction, with additions, appeared as a Supplement to the *Indian Antiquary*, vol. xlii, 1913; xliii, 1914. Separate reprint, Bombay, 1914.

ON OTHER MANUSCRIPTS FROM CENTRAL ASIA, AND CONNECTED SUBJECTS  
The Weber MSS.—Another Collection of Ancient Manuscripts from Central Asia. JASB. lxii, pt. i, p. 1, 1893.

Fragments of an Ancient Manuscript from Central Asia. Proc. ASB. 1895, p. 84.

Three further Collections of Ancient Manuscripts from Central Asia. JASB. lxvi, pt. i, p. 213, 1897.

A Note on some Block-prints from Khotan. Proc. ASB., p. 124, 1898.

Report on a British Collection of Antiquities from Central Asia. JASB. lxviii, pt. i, p. 1, 1899; lxx, pt. i, p. 1, 1901.

Transliteration of Weber MSS., Part IX, and Macartney MSS., Set I. Appendix to JASB., vol. lxx, pt. i, 1901.

On an Ancient Block-print from Khotan. JRAS. 1900, p. 321.

*Vajracchedikā*. Id. 1903, p. 364.

On Ancient MSS. from Khotan. Id. 1906, p. 695.

The Unknown Languages of Eastern Turkestan. Id. 1910, pp. 834, 1283; 1911, p. 201; ii, p. 447, 1911.

Buddhist Monastic Terms *śamaitika*, *śapālāna*, *uttari-bhāṅga*. Id. 1912, p. 736; 1913, p. 681.

A Peculiarity of the Khotanese Script. Id. 1915, p. 487.

An Early Text of the *Saddharma-piṇḍarika*. Id. 1916, p. 269.

The *Sutta Nipāta* in a Sanskrit Version from Eastern Turkestan. Id. 1916, p. 709.

Sanskrit Version of the *Sutta Nipāta*. Id. 1917, p. 134.

Manuscript Remains of Buddhist Literature found in Eastern Turkestan. Facsimiles with Transcripts Translations and Notes. Edited in conjunction with other scholars. Oxford, 1916. See also under Numismatics.

#### INDIAN MEDICINE

Studies in Ancient Indian Medicine.

I. The Commentaries on *Suśruta*. JRAS. 1906, pp. 283, 699.

II. On some Obscure Anatomical Terms. JRAS. 1906, p. 915; 1907, p. 1.

- III. The Authorship of the Caraka Saṃhitā. Archiv für Geschichte der Medizin, vol. i, p. 29, 1907.
- IV. The Composition of the Caraka Saṃhitā, and the Literary Methods of the Ancient Indian Medical Writers. JRAS. 1908, p. 997.
- V. The Composition of the Caraka Saṃhitā in the Light of the Bower Manuscript. JRAS. 1909, p. 857.
- Itsing and Vāgbhata. JRAS. 1907, p. 413.
- Studies in the Medicine of Ancient India. Part I. Osteology or the Bones of the Human Body. Oxford, 1907.
- The Bheḍa Saṃhitā in the Bower Manuscript. JRAS. 1910, p. 830.
- The *Vanashadhidarpana* or the Āyurvedic Materia Medica. *Indian Antiquary*, xli, p. 184, 1912.

## MISCELLANEOUS

- "A Hindoo Reformer." (A report of Dayānanda Sarasvatī's public disputation in Benares in 1869.) *The Christian Intelligencer*. Calcutta, March, 1870, p. 79.
- Report of Attendance at the Seventh International Congress of Orientalists, held at Vienna. Proc. ASB. 1887, p. 124.
- Obituary Notice of Nawab Abdul Latif. Id. 1893, p. 138.
- Obituary Notice of Major-General Sir A. Cunningham. Id. 1894, p. 1.
- Obituary Notice of Mr. B. H. Hodgson. Id. 1894.
- Presidential Address to the Asiatic Society of Bengal. Proc. ASB. 1898, p. 37. *Principal Contents*: Jainism and Buddhism, p. 39; Archaeology and Epigraphy, p. 55; Central Asian Antiquities, p. 63; Ethnographic and Linguistic Surveys, p. 71; History of Old Calcutta, p. 81.

## PROFESSOR JULIUS EGGELING, PH.D.

IN Julius Eggeling this Society has lost one who not only was an Honorary Member, but who began his connexion with it as Secretary just half a century ago.

He was born in the village of Hecklingen near the Hartz Mountains in the year 1842. Educated first at the *Gymnasium* (grammar school) of Bernburg, he then proceeded to study classical and Sanskrit philology at the Universities of Breslau and Berlin. He reached Breslau at the same time as another former Secretary of this Society, Professor Rhys Davids, both being bent on studying Sanskrit under Professor Stenzler. Being at the time the only pupils of that very sound scholar, they were naturally much thrown together. They thus became

very intimate for a period of nearly three years, till Rhys Davids had to return to London for a Civil Service examination, while his friend proceeded to Berlin for the purpose of continuing his Sanskrit studies under Professor Albrecht Weber. After taking his degree, Eggeling came to England in 1867 with a view to working at the Sanskrit MSS. in the libraries of the India Office and of this Society; but in the same year he migrated to Oxford in order to assist Max Müller in editing the fifth volume of his first edition of the *Rigveda*. Two years later he was appointed Secretary of the Royal Asiatic Society, and in 1872, when only just 30, also Professor of Sanskrit at University College, London. When in 1875 Professor Aufrecht vacated the Chair of Sanskrit and Comparative Philology at Edinburgh, Eggeling succeeded him. He held this post, for all but forty years, till 1914.

His labours in the sphere of Sanskrit took three directions: the compilation of catalogues of Sanskrit MSS., editions of Sanskrit grammarians, and the translation of a very extensive Brāhmaṇa.

His first published work was a catalogue of the Buddhist Sanskrit MSS. in the possession of the Royal Asiatic Society, compiled in collaboration with Professor Cowell in 1875. But his main labours in this line were connected with the India Office MSS., on which he was engaged for more than twenty years. In 1869 it had been decided, upon the proposal of the late Dr. Rost, to bring out a new catalogue of the Sanskrit MSS. in the India Office Library, the slip catalogue (in manuscript) by Sir Charles Wilkins and Professor H. H. Wilson being by that time out of date. The services of Dr. Haas and Dr. Eggeling, with whom Dr. Windisch was shortly after associated, were secured for the work, the palm-leaf MSS., in South Indian characters, being left to Dr. Rost. Seven parts of the catalogue (down to p. 1628) have appeared, the first coming out in 1886 and the last in 1904. All of

these were compiled or edited by Professor Eggeling alone, excepting the fourth, in which Dr. Windisch was associated with him. A considerable number of MSS. still remained to be dealt with,<sup>1</sup> but Professor Eggeling could not be prevailed upon to make progress with these, because he was occupied with other work, especially in connexion with the Edinburgh University Library.

During his residence in London Professor Eggeling had also begun working at the Sanskrit grammarians. The result of these studies was the publication in the *Bibliotheca Indica* (1874-8) of the *Kātantra* of Śarvavarman, who appears to have been one of the most influential of the later Sanskrit grammarians. This was followed in 1879-80 by an edition of Vardhamāna's *Gaṇaratna-mahodadhi* (A.D. 1140), a metrical arrangement of the *gaṇas* or word-groups contained in the *Gaṇapāṭha* which supplements the Grammar of Pāṇini.

After the publication of these two volumes and simultaneously with his cataloguing labours, Professor Eggeling was engaged for twenty years on his *magnum opus*, the translation of the *Śatapatha Brāhmaṇa*, the most important work of Vedic literature next to the *Rigveda*. It forms five volumes of the *Sacred Books of the East*, published respectively in 1882, 1885, 1894, 1897, and 1900. Beside Haug's version of the *Aitareya Brāhmaṇa* Eggeling's translation is the most valuable contribution yet made towards rendering the Brāhmaṇa literature accessible to students of the history of Indian religion. The completion of this work, which had absorbed his interest for so many years, filled him with regret, as causing a veritable blank in his life. His feelings must have been like those of Gibbon, who, writing of the night in which he penned the last lines of his *Decline and Fall*, says: "A sober melancholy was spread

<sup>1</sup> This remainder is being completed by Professor Keith, Professor Eggeling's successor at Edinburgh.

over my mind by the idea that I had taken an everlasting leave of an old and agreeable companion."

In addition to the works mentioned above Professor Eggeling contributed several valuable articles on Brāhmanism, Hinduism, and Sanskrit language and literature to the *Encyclopædia Britannica* and on the Veda and Sanskrit to *Chambers' Encyclopædia*.

During the last ten years of his occupancy of the Sanskrit Chair at Edinburgh, as Curator of the University Library he rendered very important services not limited to his own special line of studies. He also continued to take an active part in the business of the *Senatus*, serving on many of its Committees.

As senior member of the *Senatus* he represented the University at the centenaries of the Universities of Rome, Breslau, Berlin, and Leipzig. He also attended several of the Congresses of Orientalists which have been held for nearly half a century, generally in European capitals, at intervals of three years.

His interest in comparative philology, to lecture on which was one of the duties of his Chair, was of a somewhat old-fashioned type. He did not sympathize with the intricate and abstruse development of the science during the latter half of his life.

He was fond of modern English literature, Scott and Dickens, Burns and Tennyson being his favourites. He was also a devoted student of Goethe.

He was much attached to Scotland, where he had spent all but forty years of his life, and which he felt was his real home in the sense expressed by Goethe: "Wo du wirkst, da ist dein Vaterland." But he was also devoted to his native land, which he often revisited in the long summer vacations. Thus it came about that the outbreak of war surprised him on holiday in the German forests. This circumstance clouded the closing years of his life in quite a special manner. His German nationality had lapsed,

while he had never been naturalized in this country. He made determined efforts to return to Scotland, but could obtain neither a German nor a British passport. He accordingly sent in his resignation to the Principal of Edinburgh University, only a few months sooner than he had otherwise intended to do on completing forty years of service. He found a secluded refuge in the home of his daughter, a Westphalian village manse, among his beloved woods and surrounded by grandchildren. But he hoped to the last to be able to return and end his days at Brunstane House, his own home near Edinburgh. This hope was not to be fulfilled, for he died in Germany last March.

Professor Rhys Davids, who, as I have already shown, was intimate with Eggeling in his student days, and who continued to meet him occasionally in later years, writes about him as follows: "He was a man of unusual breadth of view, taking an enlightened interest in many things outside his special study. He was thoroughly loyal and true, and remarkably free from any thought of self-interest. The world has lost in him not only an eminent scholar, but a man of high character."

Others bear witness to his aversion from national chauvinism, his broad human sympathies, his kindliness, his shrewd common sense combined with a strain of romantic sentiment. I myself first made his acquaintance in the early eighties, when he gave me some valuable help in solving two or three difficulties I met with in the course of editing my first Sanskrit text. Since then I saw and corresponded with him at intervals. The last time I met him was in 1912 at the Congress of Orientalists held at Athens in that year. He was then 70 years of age, but still quite alert and active. The impression he has left on my mind is, to use the words of a great writer of the land in which he was so long domiciled, that of "a wise old man rich in tolerance".

A. A. MACDONELL.

# NOTES OF THE QUARTER

(October–December, 1918)

## I. GENERAL MEETINGS OF THE ROYAL ASIATIC SOCIETY

*October 8, 1918.*—Special General Meeting. Sir H. Mortimer Durand, Director, in the Chair.

The following were elected members of the Society.

Babu Mahin Chandra Das, B.A.

Professor V. S. Ghatge.

Mr. K. Lal Gurú.

Mr. Edward W. Perera.

Mr. Baraket Ullah, M.A.

Twelve nominations were approved for election at the next General Meeting.

Mr. Legge and Mr. Kennedy having explained the causes of the amalgamation between the Society of Biblical Archæology and the Royal Asiatic Society, the Provisional Agreement between the Royal Asiatic Society and the Society of Biblical Archæology, dated October 8, 1918, was ratified and confirmed.

Pursuant to this agreement members of the Society of Biblical Archæology became entitled to become ordinary resident members of the Royal Asiatic Society without nomination or election or other formality required by the Rules of the Royal Asiatic Society, on payment of a subscription of £1 10s. per annum from January 1, 1919; all life members of the Society of Biblical Archæology being treated as ordinary resident members of the Royal Asiatic Society, who have compounded for their subscriptions pursuant to Rule 19 of the Royal Asiatic Society.

A notice of the Society of Biblical Archæology will be found on pp. 25–36 of the Journal.

The Chairman moved a vote of thanks to Mr. Wilson for his kindness in acting as Hon. Solicitor for the Society.



*November 12, 1918.*—Lord Reay, President, in the Chair.

The following were elected members of the Society :—

Mr. J. Drummond Hogg.

Mr. Henry William B. Moreno, B.A.

Mr. C. C. Baker.

Mr. W. H. Rylands, F.S.A.

Dr. Tellicherry Madhavan Nair.

Mr. Saya Maung Ba.

Saddharmavagish, Rev. Sri Aryalankar Bhikshu.

Mr. Chizen-Akamuna.

Mr. Herbert E. E. Hayes.

Mr. Ikbāl Ali Shāh.

Babu Sudhi Chandra Ghosh.

Mr. Madan Gopal Mehta.

Two nominations were approved for election at the next General Meeting.

Mr. Douglas Ainslie read a paper on "Some Recent Essays on Indian Art and Life". A discussion followed, in which Mr. Yusuf Ali took part.

---

*December 10, 1918.*—Lord Reay, President, in the Chair.

The following were elected members of the Society :—

The Rev. Stanley C. E. Legg.

Mr. Fakhruddin Ahmad, M.A.

Nine nominations were approved for election at the next General Meeting.

Dr. H. Ballou Morse read a paper on "The Foreign Trade of China under Monopoly". A discussion followed, in which Professor G. Hagopian and Mr. King took part.

---

On October 8, 1918, the resignation of the Secretary, Mr. R. W. Frazer, LL.B., I.C.S. (Ret.), was received with regret, his offer of voluntary assistance to the staff until

the appointment of a successor being accepted with thanks.

On November 12, Miss Eleanor Hull was appointed to the post of Secretary in Mr. Frazer's stead.

## II. PRINCIPAL CONTENTS OF ORIENTAL JOURNALS

1. JOURNAL ASIATIQUE. Sér. XI, Tom. XI, No. ii,  
Mars-Avril, 1918.

Cordier (Henri). Édouard Chavannes.

Chabot (M. J.-B.). Punica. (*Fin.*)

2. BULLETIN DE L'ÉCOLE FRANÇAISE D'EXTRÊME-ORIENT.  
Tome XVIII, No. i, 1918.

Parmentier (H.). Anciens Tambours de Bronze.

No. ii.

Peri (Noël). Les Femmes de Çākya-Muni.

No. iii.

Maspero (Henri). Etudes d'Histoire d'Annam, iv-vi.

No. iv.

Silvestre (le Capitaine). Les Thai Blancs de Phong-Tho.

3. JEWISH QUARTERLY REVIEW. N.S., Vol. IX, Nos. i, ii,  
July and October, 1918.

Hoschander (Dr. Jacob). The Book of Esther in the  
Light of History.

Segal (Rev. M. H.). Studies in the Books of Samuel II.

Zeitlin (Dr. Solomon). Megillat Toanit as a Source for  
Jewish Chronology and History in the Hellenistic and  
Roman Periods.

Duschinsky (Dr. C.). The Rabbinate of the Great  
Synagogue, London, from 1756 to 1842.

Mann (Jacob). The Responsa of the Babylonian Geonim  
as a Source of Jewish History.

Waxman (Dr. Meyer). The Philosophy of Don Hasdai  
Crescas.

4. BULLETIN DE L'INSTITUT EGYPTIEN. Sér. V, Tome XII,  
Octobre, 1918.

- Audebeau Bey (Ch.). Observations des Savants de l'Ex-  
pédition-française sur les eaux souterraines de l'Égypte.  
Mosséri (V. M.). Quelques remarques au sujet des  
observations, etc.  
Daressy (G.). L'Ingénieur Girard et l'Institut d'Égypte.

5. PALESTINE EXPLORATION FUND. Quarterly Statement,  
October, 1918.

- Masterman (Dr. E. W. G.). Hygiene and Disease in  
Palestine in Modern and Biblical Times. (*Continued.*)  
Massey (W. T.). Jerusalem Water Supply.  
Offord (Joseph). Archæological Notes on Jewish  
Antiquities. (*Continued.*)  
— The Vicissitudes of the Population of Palestine as  
foretold in the Prophecy of Noah.

6. JOURNAL OF THE AMERICAN ORIENTAL SOCIETY.  
Vol. XXXVIII, Pt. iii, June, 1918.

- Hopkins (E. W.). The Background of Totemism.  
Worrell (W. H.). The Demon of Noonday and some  
related Ideas.  
Meek (T. J.). A Votive Inscription of Ashurbanipal  
(Bu 89-4-26, 209).  
Byrne (E. H.). Easterners in Genoa.  
Nies (J. B.). A Pre-Sargonic Inscription on Limestone  
from Warka.  
Albright (W. F.). Ninib-Ninurta.  
Laufer (B.). Édouard Chavannes.

Pt. iv, October, 1918.

- Olmstead (A. T.). The Calculated Frightfulness of Ashur  
Nasir Apal.  
Hussey (M. I.). A Galeh of Eannatum.

7. BOSTON MUSEUM OF FINE ARTS BULLETIN. No. xcvi,  
August, 1918. .

A. K. C. Rajput Painting.

No. xcvi.

A. K. C. Burmese Glazed Tiles.

8. PHILADELPHIA MUSEUM JOURNAL. Vol. VIII, No. iii,  
September, 1917.

Langdon (Stephen). A new Tablet of the Cult of deified  
Kings in Ancient Sumer.

The Chinese Expedition.

Vol. IX, No. ii.

Bishop (C. W.). Two Chinese Bronze Vessels.

— Recent Accessions of Chinese Sculpture.

Sayce (A. H.). The Museum Collection of Cappadocian  
Tablets.

Langdon (Stephen). A Tablet on the Mysteries of Baby-  
lonian Symbolism.

— A Sumerian Liturgy containing an Ode to the Word.

9. NUMISMATIC CHRONICLE. Pt. i, Nos. lxix, lxx, 1918.

Codrington (H. W.). The Persian Weight Standard in  
Mediaeval India.

10. JOURNAL OF THE ROYAL ANTHROPOLOGICAL INSTITUTE.  
Vol. XLVIII, January-June, 1918.

Presidential Address: Primitive Art and its Modern  
Developments.

Barton (Captain F. R.). Tattooing in South-Eastern  
New Guinea.

Giuffrida-Ruggieri (V.). A Sketch of the Anthropology  
of Italy.

Roth (H. Ling). Studies in Primitive Looms. Part iv.  
(Conclusion.)

Read (Carveth). No Paternity.

Fleure (H. J.) and Winstanley (Miss L.). Anthropology  
and our Older Histories.

11. T'OUNG PAO. Vol. XVII, Nos. iv, v, October and December, 1916.

Laufer (Berthold). Loan-words in Tibetan.

Cordier (Henri). *Mélanges*: Sur une traduction latine inédite du Tchoung Young.

— La suppression de la Compagnie de Jésus et la mission de Pékin. (*Fin.*)

Vol. XVIII, Nos. i, ii, Mars et Mai, 1918.

Laufer (Berthold). La Mandragore.

Mathieu (G.). Le système musical.

Cordier (Henri). Le Christianisme en Chine et en Asie Centrale sous les Mongols.

Nécrologie: Edouard Chavannes, Aristide Marre, par H. Cordier.

12. JOURNAL OF THE NORTH CHINA BRANCH OF THE ROYAL ASIATIC SOCIETY. Vol. XLIX, 1918.

Chatley (Herbert). River Problems in China.

Laver (H. E.). Some Notes on Land Birds.

Zwemer (Samuel M.). Animistic Elements in Moslem Prayer.

Ling (Peter C.). The Eight Immortals of the Taoist Religion.

A Chapter on Folklore.

Ferguson (J. C.). Ku K'ai-Chih's Scroll in the British Museum.

Bruce (J. P.). The Theistic Import of the Sung Philosophy.

Morgan (Evan). A Case of Ritualism.

Kiliene (Charles). Chinese Puzzledom.

13. TRANSACTIONS AND PROCEEDINGS OF THE JAPAN SOCIETY. Vol. XVI, 1917-18.

*Anjindzuka*, the Memorial to Will Adams.

Diosy (Arthur). Japan's Part in the War.

Edwards (Osman). Some unpublished Letters of Lafcadio Hearn.

- Blair (James). The Japanese Mercantile.  
 Khorī (T.). Japanese Drama.  
 Fremantle (Admiral the Hon. Sir Ed.). Reminiscences  
 of Japan.  
 Gordon (Mrs. Will). Glimpses of Old Korea.  
 Weston (Mrs. Frances). Fuji San, Old and New.  
 Kato (N.). Education in Japan.

14. RIVISTA DEGLI STUDI ORIENTALI. Vol. VII, Pt. i.  
 Cerulli (E.). Canti e Proverbi somali nel dialetto degli  
 Habār Auwāl.  
 — Testi di diritto consuetudinario dei Somali Marrēhān.  
 — Di alcune presunte consonanti nei dialetti somali.  
 Zanolli (A.). Sentenzi ed aneddoti attribuiti a Menandro  
 dalla tradizione gnomologica armena.  
 Furlani (G.). Di una raccolta di trattati astrologici in  
 lingua siriana.  
 15. JOURNAL AND PROCEEDINGS OF THE ASIATIC SOCIETY OF  
 BENGAL. N.S., Vol. XIV, Nos. i, ii, May, 1918.  
 Firminger (Walter K.). The Malda Diary and Consulta-  
 tions (1680-2).

No. iii.

- Annandale (N.). A Bismar Weighing-beam from the  
 Darjeeling District.  
 Dinesh Chandra Bhattarcharya. Bhavabhūti as a Mi-  
 mansaka.  
 Numismatic Supplement.

16. JOURNAL OF THE BOMBAY BRANCH OF THE ROYAL ASIATIC  
 SOCIETY. No. lxxi.  
 Saldanha (J. A.). Philology and Ethnology and their  
 bearing on Customary Law in the Bombay Presidency.  
 — Survival of Portuguese Institutions in British  
 Western India.  
 Venkatachellam Iyer (V.). Sraosha of the Zoroastrian  
 System: his Identity.

Modi (Shams-ul-Ulma, Dr. J. J.). The Mogul Emperors at Kashmir. Jehangir's inscription at Virnâg. An inscription on the Dâl Lake.

— The Story of the King and the Gardener in the Waki'ât-i Jehangiri of Emperor Jehangir and its parallels.

— An instance of Royal Swayamvara as described in the Shah Nâmeh of Firdausi.

— Archery in Ancient Persia: a few extraordinary Feats.

Bhandarkar (Sir R. G.). The Aryans in the Land of the Assurs (Skr. Asura).

Commissariat (Professor M. S.). A Brief History of the Gujarat Sultanat.

Nasarvanji Munshi (Rustamji). The Life Story of the old Portuguese Bell in the National Dabul Church at Girgaum, Bombay.

Zimmerman (Rev. R., S.J.). Śaṅkarāchārya and Kant: A Comparison.

Rock-cut Elephant from Gharapari: A letter from Sir George Birdwood.

17. INDIAN ANTIQUARY. Vol. XLVI, Pt. dlxxxviii,  
November, 1917.

Stein (Sir A.). A Third Journey of Exploration in Central Asia, 1913-16.

Temple (Sir R. C., Bart.). Job Charnock—his Parentage and Will.

Amesh Chandra Majumdar. The Date of Kanishka.

Rangachari (V.). The History of the Naik Kingdom of Madura.

Vol. XLVII, Pt. dxc, January, 1918.

Temple (Sir R. C., Bart.). Austria's Commercial Venture in India in the Eighteenth Century.

Pathak (K. B.). New Light on the Gupta Era and Mihirakula.

Zimmerman (Robert). An additional Proof for the Genuineness of the Vrittis in Mammata's Kavya-prakasa.

Divatia (N. B.). The wide sound of *e* and *o*, with special reference to Gujarati.

Part dxcī, February, 1918.

Temple (Sir R. C., Bart.). Austria's Commercial Venture in India in the Eighteenth Century.

Majumdar (N. G.). Date of the Abhira Migration into India.

Divatia (N. B.). The wide sound of *e* and *o*, with special reference to Gujarati.

Smith (Vincent A.). Asoka Notes, No. XII.

Jayaswal (K. P.). The Athasastra explains.

Part dxcii, March, 1918.

Temple (Sir R. C., Bart.). Austria's Commercial Venture in India in the Eighteenth Century.

Bhandarkar (Professor D. R.). Dekkan of the Satavahana Period.

Gopinatha Rao (T. A.). Vivekapatiāmala.

18. EPIGRAPHIA INDICA. Vol. XIII, Pt. v, January, 1916.

Fleet (J. F.). Some Records of the Rashtrakuta Kings of Malkhed. (*Concluded.*)

Venkateswara (Professor S. V.). Conjeeveram Copper-plate of Vijaya-Gandagopaladeva, A.D. 1291-2.

Barnett (Lionel D.). Thana Plates of the time of the Yadava King Ramachandra: Saka 1194.

— Gagaha Plates of Govindachandra of Kanauj: Samvat 1199.

— Two Grants of Venkatapati I: Saka 1508 and 1535.

— Vemavaram Grant of Allaya-Vema Reddi: Saka 1356.

Garde (M. B.). Three Copper-plates of the time of the Chahamana Kelhana.



Ramdas Pantulu (G.). Siddhantam Plates of Devendra-varman : the 195th year.

Gopinatha Rao (T.). Srirangam Plates of Madhava Nayaka : Saka-Samvat 1343.

Part vi, April, 1916.

Barnett (Lionel D.). Vema-varam Grant of Allaya-Vema Reddi. (*Concluded.*)

Rama Sastri (K.). Akkala-pundi Grant of Singaya-Nayaka : Saka-Samvat 1290.

Konow (Sten). Talegaon Copper-plates of Krishna-raja : Saka 690.

Radha Govinda Basak. Silimpur Stone-slab Inscription of the time of Jaya-pala-deva.

Part vii.

Radha Govinda Basak. Silimpur Stone-slab Inscription of the time of Jayapala-Deva.

Hirananda Sastri. Copper-plate Inscription of Govindachandra-Deva : Samvat 1186.

Barnett (Lionel D.). Inscriptions at Narendra.

— Kalas Inscription of the Rashtrakuta Govinda IV : Saka 851.

Vol. XIV, Pt. i, January, 1917.

Sewell (Robert). The True Longitude of the Sun in Hindu Astronomy.

19. CEYLON ANTIQUARY. Vol. IV, Pt. i, July, 1918.

S. G. P. Ceylon according to Friar Oderico.

Gaspard (Rev. E.). Ceylon according to du Jarrie.

Bell (H. P. C.) and Codrington (H. W.). Critical Notes on the Epigraphia Zeylanica.

Turner (L. J. B.). The Madras Administration of the Maritime Provinces of Ceylon, 1795-8.

Part ii.

Methley (Miss Violet M.). Letters of Captain Herbert Beaver (H.M. 19th Regiment).

Turner (L. J. B.). The Town of Kandy about the year 1815 A.D.

Verstraeten (Rev. A. M., S.J.) and Stace (W. T.). Reason and Religion.

Perera (Rev. S. G., S.J.). The Jesuits in Ceylon in the Sixteenth and Seventeenth Centuries.

Bell (H. C. P.). Inscribed Pillar at Anuradhapura.

20. JOURNAL OF THE BIHAR AND ORISSA RESEARCH SOCIETY.  
Vol. IV, Pt. i, March, 1918.

Haraprasād Sastri (Mahamahopādhyāya). Gazetteer Literature in Sanskrit.

Jayaswal (K. P.). The Brihadratha Chronology (*circ.* 1727-727 B.C.).

— The Terms "Anusamyana", "Rājūka", and "Former Kings" in Asoka's Inscriptions.

#### Part ii.

Sen (D. N.). Sites in Rajgir associated with Buddha and his Disciples.

— Buddhism and Vedantism : A Parallel.

Jayaswal (K. P.). Asoka's Inscriptions (II).

Sikdar (J. N.). References to Education in the Jatakas.

Haraprasad Sastri (Mahamahopādhyaya). Tekkali Inscriptions of Madhyamarāja, the son of Petavyālloparāja.

— Grant of Ranastāmbhadeva.

— Khandadeuli Inscriptions of Ranabhanja Deva.

Banerji (R. D.). Some Unpublished Records of the Sultans of Bengal.

Mitra (S. C.). On the use of the Swallow-worts in the Ritual, Sorcery, and Leechcraft of the Hindus and Pre-Islamitic Arabs.

Roy (S. C.). Birth, Childhood, and Puberty Ceremonies among the Bihors.

— The Marriage Customs of the Bihors.

Khan Bahadur Saiyid Zamir-ud-din Ahmad. Ghulam Ali Rasik.

## 21. THE CALCUTTA REVIEW. No. ccxcii, April, 1918.

Yusuf Ali (A.). India and the Empire.

Farquhar (J. N.). The Bhagavata Purana and the Sects dependent thereon.

Bradley-Birt (F. B.). Ispahan.

## 22. JOURNAL OF THE STRAITS BRANCH, ROYAL ASIATIC SOCIETY. No. lxxviii, June, 1918.

Winstedt (R. O.). Jelebu Customary Songs and Sayings, collected by A. Caldecott.

—— Some Lexicographical Notes, from the Dutch.

—— The Tomb of Mansur Shah.

## No. lxxix, September, 1918.

Gibbs (Miss L. S.). Some peculiar Papuan Customs.

Blagden (C. O.). The Cannibal King in the Kedah Annals.

Winstedt (R. O.). The Hadramaut Saiyids of Perak and Siak.

—— Some Perak Pedigrees.

—— The Hindu Element in Malay Marriage Ceremony.



## ADDITIONS TO THE LIBRARY

- Ahmad 'Abd-ul-Azīz, Shams-ul-Ulma Maulavi.** *Āsaf ul-Laghāt. Hindustani-Persian Dictionary.* Vol. xi. 8vo. *Haidarabad*, A.H. 1335.
- ARCHÆOLOGICAL SURVEY, BURMA.** Report of the Superintendent for the year ending March 31, 1918. 4to. *Rangoon*, 1918.  
*From the Government of India.*
- ARCHÆOLOGICAL SURVEY OF INDIA.** Annual Reports.
1. Eastern Circle, 1916-17. 4to. *Calcutta*, 1918.
  2. Frontier Circle, 1917-18. 4to. *Peshawar*, 1918.
  3. Southern Circle, 1917-18. 4to. *Madras*, 1918.  
*From the Government of India.*
- Bastavala, Dinoo S.** *Stray Thoughts on the War.* Pamphlet. *Bombay*, 1918.  
*From the Ministry of Information.*
- Boaz, FRANZ.** *Grammatical Notes on the Language of the Tlingit Indians.* University Museum, Anthropological Publications, vol. viii, No. i. 8vo. *Philadelphia*.  
*From the University Museum.*
- Bobbili, MAHARAJA SIR V. S. RANGARAO BAHADUR.** *Hindu Religion.* Translated by M. Krishnamachariar. 8vo. *Madras*, 1918.  
*From the Author.*
- CATALOGUE OF COPPER-PLATE GRANTS IN THE GOVERNMENT MUSEUM, MADRAS.** roy. 8vo. *Madras*, 1918.  
*From the Government Museum, Madras.*
- CATALOGUE DES LIVRES ARABES DE LA MOSQUÉE D'EL-QAROUYINE À FÈS.** 4to. *Fès*, 1918.  
*From Mr. H. L. Rabino.*
- Cordier, Henri.** Édouard Chavannes. *Extrait du Journal Asiatique* (Mars-Avril, 1918). *Paris*, 1918.  
*From the Author.*
- Croste, Dr. René.** *Le Svastika. Son histoire—ses significations—son existence et ses déformations au Pays Basque. Cultes qui s'y rattachent.* Extrait du Bulletin Trimestriel de la Société Bayonnaise d'Études Régionales. *Bayonne*, 1918.  
*From the Author.*

- Czaplicka, A. M.** The Turks of Central Asia in History and at the Present Day. An Ethnological Inquiry into the Pan-Turanian Problem, and Bibliographical Material relating to the Early Turks and the Present Turks of Central Asia. 8vo. *Oxford*, 1918. *From the Publishers.*
- Deshmukh, L. G.** Short Account of India to 1915. sm. 8vo. *Poona*, 1917. *From the Author.*
- Dussek, O. T.** Těka-Těki. Malay Literature Series, 14. 2 vols. 8vo. *Singapore*, 1918. *From the Author.*
- Forrest, Sir George.** The Life of Lord Olive. 2 vols. 8vo. *London*, 1918. *From the Publishers.*
- Foucher, A.** L'Art Gréco-bouddhique du Gandhara. Étude sur les origines de l'influence classique dans l'art bouddhique de l'Inde et de l'Extrême-Orient. Tome ii, premier fascicule : Les Images, avec 175 illustrations et 4 planches. Publications de l'École française d'Extrême-Orient. roy. 8vo. *Paris*, 1918. *From the Publishers.*
- The Beginnings of Buddhist Art and other Essays in Indian and Central Asian Archæology. Revised by the author and translated by L. A. Thomas and F. W. Thomas, with a preface by the latter. super-royal 8vo. *London*, 1917. *From the Publisher.*
- Frazer, Sir James George.** Folklore in the Old Testament. 3 vols. 8vo. *London*, 1918. *From the Publishers.*
- Grierson, Sir George.**
- (1) The Pārijāta-Harana of Umāpati Upādhāya. Reprinted from the Journal of the Bihar and Orissa Research Society, March, 1917. *Patna*, 1917.
  - (2) The Ūrmurī or Bargista Language. An account of a little-known Eranian Dialect. Memoirs of the Asiatic Society of Bengal, vol. vii, No. 1. *Calcutta*, 1918. *From the Author.*
- Hirschfeld, Hartwig.** Qirqisani Studies. Jews' College, Publication No. 6. Pamphlet. *London*, 1918. *From the Publishers.*

**Hoo-Chi-Tsai.** Les Bases Conventionnelles des Relations Modernes entre la Chine et la Russie. Préface par M. Henri Cordier. Carte de la Frontière Sino-Russe. 8vo. *Paris*, 1918.

*From the Author.*

**Hrdlička, Ales.** Recent Discoveries attributed to Early Man in America. Smithsonian Institution, Bureau of American Ethnology, Bulletin 66. 8vo. *Washington*, 1918.

*From the Government of the United States.*

**IN MEMORY OF JULIUS EGGELING**, Dr. Philos., Professor of Sanskrit and Comparative Philology in the University of Edinburgh, 1842-1918. pp. 11. Privately printed, 1918.

*From Mr. H. F. Eggeling.*

**Kane, P. V.** The Harshacharita of Bāṇabhaṭṭa (Uchchhvāsa i-viii), with notes. *Bombay*, 1918. *From the Author.*

**KANGRA DISTRICT.** Panjab District Gazetteers. Vol. xxx A, 1917. With maps and photographs. roy. 8vo. *Lahore*, 1918. *From the Government of India.*

**Kaye, G. R.** The Astronomical Observations of Jai Singh. Archæological Survey of India, New Imp. Ser., xl. 4to. *Calcutta*, 1918. *From the Government of India.*

**Kern, Professor H.** Verspreide Geschriften. Vol. viii. 8vo. 's Gravenhage, 1918. *From the Publishers.*

**King, Leonard W.** Legends of Babylon and Egypt in relation to Hebrew Tradition. The British Academy, Schweich Lectures, 1916. *London*. 8vo. 1918.

*From the Publisher.*

**Krishna Rao, H. P.** The Psychology of Music. sm. 8vo. *Mysore*, 1916. *From the Author.*

**Kuppuswami Sastri, S.** A Descriptive Catalogue of the Sanskrit MSS. in the Government Oriental Manuscripts Library, Madras. Vols. xx-xxi: Kāvyaś. 8vo. *Madras*, 1918.

**LIST OF SANSKRIT AND HINDI MSS.** Purchased by order of Government and deposited in the Sanskrit College, Benares, during the year 1916-17. 8vo. *Allahabad*, 1918.

*From the Government of India.*

- Lyall, Sir Charles J.** Some Aspects of Ancient Arabic Poetry, as illustrated by a little-known Anthology. From the Proceedings of the British Academy, vol. viii. *London*, 1918. *From the Publisher.*
- Marshall, Sir John.** A Guide to Sanchi. 8vo. *Calcutta*, 1918. *From the Government of India.*
- Meillier, M.** Bibliothèque Royale de Luang-Prabang. Catalogue. *Hanoi-Haiphong*, 1918. *From the École française d'Extrême-Orient.*
- Métin, Albert.** L'Inde d'aujourd'hui. Étude sociale. Nouvelle édition mise à jour et augmentée. *Paris*, 1917. *From the Editors.*
- Morse, H. B.**
1. The International Relations of the Chinese Empire. 3 vols. 8vo. *London*, 1910, 1918.
  2. The Guilds of China. With an account of the Guild Merchant or Co-Hong of Canton. 8vo. *London*, 1909. *From the Author.*
- Muhammad 'Asal, Shaykh.** The Pearl Strings; a History of the Resûliyy Dynasty of Yemen by 'Aliyyu 'bnu 'l-Ḥasan 'el-Khazrejiyy; the Arabic Text with indices by R. A. Nicholson, and printed for the Trustees of the E. J. W. Gibb Memorial. Vol. V, containing the second half of the Arabic text. *Leyden*, 1918. *From the Trustees of the E. J. W. Gibb Memorial.*
- Newman, Louis I., and William Popper.** Studies in Biblical Parallelism, parts i and ii. Imp. 8vo. University of California, 1918. *From the University of California.*
- Parker, R. N.** A Forest Flora for the Panjab with Hazara and Delhi. 8vo. *Lahore*, 1918. *From the Conservator of Forests, Panjab.*
- Perry, W. J.** The Megalithic Culture of Indonesia. 8vo. *Manchester*, 1918. *From the Author.*
- Phillott, Lieut.-Colonel D. C.** Colloquial English-Persian Dictionary in the Roman character. Containing all English words in common use with their meanings in modern Persian, with numerous examples. sm. 4to. *Calcutta*, 1914. *From the Author.*

PHOTOGRAPHS OF THE NORTH-WEST FRONTIER OF INDIA,  
about 120 in number.

*From the Royal Geographical Society.*

Poetoe Djlantik, I Goesti. Wetboek "Agama" in het Hoog-  
Baleisch en Maleisch vertaald. Herzien en Verbeterd door  
H. J. E. F. Schwartz. 8vo. *Batavia*, 1918.

*From Commissie voor de Volkslectuur.*

Ponsonby-Fane, Richard. The Imperial Family of Japan.  
Giving the Lineage of the Oldest Dynasty in the World.  
Post 8vo. *Kobe*, n.d. *From Miss Helen Farquhar.*

PRINCIPLES OF THE INTERNATIONAL PHONETIC ASSOCIATION.  
Edited by Paul Passy and Daniel Jones. Supplement to  
the *Maitre Phonétique*, Sept.-Oct., 1912.

*From Mr. Daniel Jones.*

Pupin, Michael J. Serbian Orthodox Church. South Slav  
Monuments, I. With an introduction by Sir Thomas  
Graham Jackson, Bart. *Loulon*, 1918.

*From the Publishers.*

RECORDS OF FORT ST. GEORGE.

1. Diary and Consultation Book of 1693.

2. Index to Revenue Department Proceedings, 1884. fol.  
*Madras*, 1918. *From the India Office.*

Richards, F. J. Salem. Madras District Gazetteers. 2 vols.  
8vo. *Madras*, 1918. *From the Government of India.*

Seager, Richard B. The Cemetery of Pachyammos, Crete.  
University Museum, Anthropological Publications, vol. vii,  
No. 1. sup.-roy. 8vo. *Philadelphia*, 1916.

*From the University Museum.*

Smith, Vincent A. The Oxford Students' History of India.  
Seventh edition, revised and enlarged. 14 maps and 34  
illustrations. cr. 8vo. *Oxford*, 1918.

*From the Publishers.*

SWAMI-SHREE SACCHIDÂNAND: Portrait.

*From Dr. Codrington.*

TAKHRIR MAJLIS AL-AHBÂS. Reports of the First and Second  
Sessions of the Council of the Ministry of Endowments,  
Government of Morocco. *Rabat*, 1918.

*From Mr. H. L. Rabino.*



**Thompson, Captain R. Campbell.** A Small Handbook of the History and Antiquities of Mesopotamia. From the earliest times to the end of the Sassanian period. Pamphlet. *Baghdad*, 1918. *From the Author.*

**Waley, Arthur.** A Hundred and Seventy Chinese Poems. Translated. 8vo. *London*, 1918. *From the Author.*  
The first part consists of Selections ranging from Ch'ü Yüan in the third century B.C., through the Han, Chin, Liang, Ming, T'ang, and Sung dynasties, including a few Taoist poems; the second part contains poems by Po Chü-i of the ninth century.

**Willcocks, Sir William.** From the Garden of Eden to the Crossing of the Jordan. Pamphlet. 8vo. *Cairo* [1918].  
*From the Author.*

**Wilson, C. R.** The Early Annals of the English in Bengal, being the Bengal Public Consultations for the First Half of the Eighteenth Century. Summarized, extracted, and edited. Vol. iii, 1718-22. Prepared for publication with an Introduction and Appendices by Walter Kelly Firmininger, B.D., B.Litt., Archdeacon of Calcutta. 8vo. *Calcutta*, 1917. *From the Government of India.*

Deals with the Governorship of Samuel Feake and events at the Patna, Hughli, and Balasor Factories.

#### PAMPHLETS ON BAHAIISM.

1. **Abdul Baha in London:** Addresses and Notes of Conversations. 8vo. *London*, 1912.

2. **The Covenant; Address on the Covenant.** Pamphlet. *New York*, 1912.

3. **Abul Fazl Gulpaygan, Mirza.** The Brilliant Proof (Burhāne Lāmē). Written December 28, 1911, in Syria. *Chicago*, 1912.


4. **Dawud, Yuhanna.** The Mysterious Forces of Civilisation. Written in Persian by an eminent Bahai Philosopher and now first put into English. 8vo. *London*, n.d.

And other books on the same subject.

*From Mr. Yuhanna Dawud.*

---





THE AVROMAN DOCUMENT.

# JOURNAL

OF THE

# ROYAL ASIATIC SOCIETY

# 1919

---

## VI

### THE PAHLAVI DOCUMENT FROM AVROMAN

By A. COWLEY

IN the Journal of Hellenic Studies for 1915, p. 22, Mr. Minns published two Greek documents of the Parthian period acquired by Dr. Sa'id Khan from Avroman in Kurdistan, together with the facsimile of a third, not in Greek, which was found at the same place.<sup>1</sup> As the writing of this third document (on parchment) seemed to be Aramaic in character, he very kindly sent me a photograph of it at the time, and has since given me additional information. The following note represents mainly what I then made out of the text, but it has lain in a drawer ever since because the results seemed hardly worth publishing. It is only in the hope of attracting the attention of more competent Iranian scholars to it that I now print these few remarks, on the principle that

לא עליו המלאכה לגמור ולא אתה בן חורין לבטל

The text is in Pahlavi, written in an Aramaic alphabet, with a number of Semitic words in it. The writing is so cursive that it is difficult to distinguish letters which resemble one another, as  $\text{ר, } \text{ך, } \text{ב; } \text{כ, } \text{ז, } \text{נ; } \text{ן}$ . Moreover, the parchment is broken or defaced in some places. So far as it is legible, it seems to read as follows:—

<sup>1</sup> For a full account of them see the article in question.

- 1 שנת 100 ק ירחא ארותת מיבנו פתספך ברי תורין  
 2 100. 1. 100 כרמא אסמך מה אבידשון פלג יאת  
 3 רזבנו אויל ברי בשנן דד אחי כלא זוזן ך ך ך ך  
 4 מה מן בומחזתי א . . ח . . המי אדלו קדמתה  
 5 שהדין תירך ברי אפין . . . . ברי רשנו ארשתת  
 6 ברי אבנו גריפנדי ברי מתרפדי סינך ברי מאתבנג  
 7 . . . . . כרמא אסמתן כרמא וינת אויל מן  
 8 פתספך כלא זוזן ך ך ך ך

Line 1 begins with a date. After "year" the three strokes are no doubt units, as in Aramaic papyri,<sup>1</sup> though rather more rounded. The next letter is like a regular Aramaic ק, not the q of this document (if it occurs, see l. 4), so that it would seem that the more original form was preserved as a cipher, for 100. It is true that letters are never used as numerals in the papyri, but their use as such became common, probably long before the date of this text. It is hardly possible that the letter is ך and stands for Persian صد = hundred. The name of the month is Arotat, Zend Haurvatât.<sup>2</sup> The next word is very puzzling. We should expect a verb if it were Aramaic, but it is similar in form to 3<sup>1</sup>, and as a name follows in both places it is more probably a title. The middle character seems to be a combination of perhaps וב or יב. I suggest that it is מיבנו = ميبان a "wine-merchant". At the end are two words connected by ברי. This is clearly the Aramaic בר with the Persian *izâfat*, "son of," as in the Hajiabad inscription B.<sup>3</sup> Hence the words on either side of it must be names. There are no really satisfactory parallels to them in Justi's *Iranisches Namenbuch*.

<sup>1</sup> This refers throughout to the papyri from Elephantine, published by Sayce & Cowley (*Aram. Pap. discovered at Assuan*) in 1906, and by Sachau (*Aramäische Papyrus*) in 1911. Both with good facsimiles.

<sup>2</sup> See Benfey, *Monatsnamen*, pp. 79, 93.

<sup>3</sup> So denoted by Westergaard. The language is generally called Chaldaeo-Pahlavi. It is on the upper part of plate 2.

Line 2. The beginning is defaced. There are first two strokes, then a word illegible, then a strange sign followed by 𐭪𐭫. I at first thought this might be the Persian word for "one", and the whole group might be 221. But this is improbable, and I can suggest nothing else. The next word is 𐭪𐭫𐭮, Aramaic for "vineyard". If the preceding words were a numeral, we might read it 𐭪𐭫𐭮 = 𐭪𐭫𐭮, supposing the form to be possible at this date.

𐭪𐭫𐭮 is probably the name of the vineyard.

𐭪𐭫 is no doubt to be so read. The second letter corresponds to the sign which we used to read as *-man* in accordance with the Pahlavi tradition. It is almost identical in form with the 𐭪 (especially when final) in the papyri. It is not the same as the ligature in 𐭪𐭫𐭮 (l. 1).

𐭪𐭫𐭮 looks like a good Persian word, as if compounded with داشتن, but meaning?

𐭪𐭫𐭮 Aramaic "half". One would expect 𐭪𐭫𐭮.

𐭪𐭫𐭮 seems to be the only way of reading the word. A relative?

Line 3. 𐭪𐭫𐭮 = رزبان is formed in the same way as 𐭪𐭫𐭮 in l. 1.

The names following are not found in Justi.

𐭪𐭫 = 𐭪𐭫.

𐭪𐭫. The same sign is used for 𐭪 medial as for 𐭪. I thought at first that 𐭪𐭫 𐭪𐭫 must mean دادی, but "you gave" is unlikely in a document of this kind.

𐭪𐭫 is probably the Pahlavi *ae*, "this," meaning "that is".

𐭪𐭫𐭮 Aramaic "the whole".

The next word is very puzzling. I think it must be 𐭪𐭫, since the Aramaic 𐭪𐭫 is sometimes found as equivalent to a drachma,<sup>1</sup> the coin used in the Greek deeds. (Originally a vague term for a small coin; Assyrian *zāzu* is "to divide".<sup>2</sup>) But the plural is written 𐭪𐭫𐭮.

<sup>1</sup> E.g. in Palmyrene; cf. de Vogüé, *Syrie Centrale*, p. 21, No. 17, 5, where 𐭪𐭫𐭮 corresponds to δ[ραχμῶν] or Ἀρ[τῆκᾶς] μύπλᾱς.

<sup>2</sup> Cf. Meissner in OLZ, 1918, p. 171. It then meant a half-shekel.

in שודין, l. 5. It might be the Persian زرین "gold (piece)", but the Parthians are not known to have had a gold coinage. The following signs are numerals: 10 + 20 + 20 + 5. The form of the 20 is modified from that found in the papyri.

Line 4. מה probably, as in l. 2.

מן Aramaic "from" or "by".

בומחוזי is a possible Persian compound for "landlord", though it does not appear in the dictionaries.

The next word is broken and I cannot restore it. One would expect a name and that the landlord was ARIL(?), but it cannot be that.

המי might be the old form of Persian می, the verbal particle, or the Pahlavi *hamdē* = "all".

ארלו or ארלו should be a verb, something like "received", but the form is impossible.

קדמתה. After much thought I read the word so, comparing it with the same word in Hajiabad B 5, "before," "in the presence of" (Aramaic). The ק has nearly the same form as the letter כ above.

Line 5. שודין Aramaic "witnesses". The form with ש is still used, as in the papyri, not כ as in later Aramaic. It had, no doubt, become fixed as a legal term.

Their names should then follow, and, in fact, we have a series of pairs connected by ברי.

תירך. Justi gives Tirik. תורך (Turak) would also be possible.

אפין not in Justi.

The next name is obliterated.

רשנו. Justi gives Rašnu, a name derived from that of the genius Rašnu.

ארשתה. Justi gives Arštad, also derived from the genius of that name.

Line 6. ברי can be restored with certainty.

אבנו not in Justi.

נריפנדי is the most probable reading, but I know of no such name.

מתרפדי not in Justi, but a good Persian formation. "Mithra is protector." Cf. *Μιτραπεύτης*, Hdt. iii, 120. The *th* is noticeable. In the Greek documents we have *Μιπαδύτης*, etc. It looks as though the change was not yet established.

סינך Justi Sinakes.

מאתבננ. The reading is uncertain.

Lines 7 and 8 seem to be a sort of endorsement, re-stating the matter.

Line 7. The beginning is unfortunately lost.

כרמא as in l. 2, followed by אסמתן (ת uncertain); cf. אסמך. l. 2. It is difficult to see how the second כרמא is to be construed.

The reading of the next word is uncertain. Perhaps the first letter is ז. The second might be ב, or more probably ד (ד). One thinks of Aramaic זבן, or Persian زب in one of its many meanings, or Zend *vid*, but I do not venture any suggestion.

אריל as in l. 3.

מן Aramaic "from".

Line 8. פתספך as in l. 1.

The rest is repeated from l. 3.

The meaning appears to be somewhat as follows:—

(1) Year 300, month Arotat, the vintner PTSPK son of TURIN,

(2) the price of (?) the vineyard ASMK, which is the payment (?) of half belonging (?) to

(3) the wine-grower ARIL son of BŠNIN, gave; that is, total zuzin 55.

(4) Which by the landlord X . . . is acknowledged (?) before

(5) the witnesses Tirik son of APIN, Y . . . son of Rašnu, Arštad



(6) son of ABNU, GRIPNHI son of Mithrapadi, Sinak son of MATBNG.

(7) Price of(?) the vineyard ASMTN, the vineyard belonging(?) to ARIL, from

(8) PTSPK: total, zuzin 55.

That is to say, the vineyard belonged to the landlord X . . . who had let half of it to ARIL. This half is now bought by (or the lease of it assigned to) PTSPK for 55 zuzin (or drachmæ). The landlord certifies before witnesses that he agrees to the deal and that the money is paid.

Some points are still obscure, but one need not be ashamed of that when one considers how little is understood of the Hajiabad inscriptions, even after the efforts of such scholars as Haug and West.<sup>1</sup>

Assuming that the Seleucid era is used, as in the Greek documents (so Minns), the date 300 Sel. is 12 (or 11) B.C. This text therefore stands about midway between the latest cuneiform Persian and the earliest Sassanian inscriptions, and is the *only* specimen we have of the language during that interval of 600 years. The writing may best be compared with the character used in the Hajiabad inscription<sup>2</sup> B, of Sapor I, and allowing for the difference of material shows an earlier stage of development from the Aramaic alphabet as it appears in the papyri. Other early specimens of Pahlavi are those in the Rainer Collection, on parchment and papyrus, and those published by Sachau in the *Zeitschrift für ägyptische Sprache*, 1878, p. 114, which he ascribes to the eighth century. It is more probable that they date from the few years during which the Persians held Egypt (616–25 A.D.). There are also some fragments, on paper and linen, in the Bodleian Library (MS. Pers. b. 2 (P)).

<sup>1</sup> Cf. also the strange translation of another inscription in the *Indian Antiquary*, xi, p. 225.

<sup>2</sup> See plate 2.

In all these the writing has reached the same hopeless state of confusion which is familiar to us in MSS. of modern "book-Pahlavi", so much so that Sachau does not attempt to transliterate his fragments, though he notices some variations from the traditional forms, showing that these were not yet fixed.


As to the language of the document it is better not to say much until it has been more fully explained. Cuneiform Persian contains no Aramaic words, although Aramaic was regularly used in the Great King's Foreign Office correspondence. By the date of this document Aramaic had become firmly fixed in the language, very much as we find it at Hajiabad. Thus we have *כרמא*, *שוהדין*, *קדמתה*, *מן*, *כלא*, *פלג*, *מה*, *בר*, *ירחא*, *שנת*, all but the last two being found in later Pahlavi. From the use of the *izāfat* in *ברי* we may perhaps conclude that the words were read as Persian, being regarded as a sort of ideograms, just as Sumerian signs in Babylonian were read as Semitic words. The practice seems to have been natural to the countries in contact with Mesopotamia. In the purely Persian words, if I am right about *רזנו* = *رزبان* and *דא* = *داد*, it appears that *d* was not necessarily marked by *א*. The retention of *ת* in *מתרפרי* has already been noted.

The subject of the text seems to be related to that of the Greek documents accompanying it, though not necessarily concerned with the same estate. Still, if the vineyard was called Dadbakanras (i A 11) or Ganzake (i B 12) or Dadbakabag (ii AB 7), it might even have had a fourth name, ASMK or ASMTN. [The last suggests a derivation from Pahlavi *asimīn*, Persian *نسيم*, as if "silver-bodied", but this is unsuitable as a place-name.] At any rate, it is noticeable that apparently the half only was sold, as in Greek i B 14, and that the price is 55 zuzin(?) as in Greek ii, 6, it is 55 drachmæ.

On the back of Greek i there are some lines of Pahlavi writing, but, after many attempts I have failed to read any complete word with certainty. The existence of this endorsement, however, shows that there is some connexion between the Pahlavi and the Greek.

The accompanying plates give (1) a facsimile of the document from a block kindly lent by the Hellenic Society; (2) for purposes of comparison, a reproduction of the Hajiabad inscriptions from casts in the National Museum, Dublin. I am very much indebted to Dr. Smyly, Librarian of Trinity College, for telling me of the whereabouts of the casts, and to Dr. Scharff, the Acting Director of the Museum, and Mr. J. J. Buckley, the Keeper, for their readiness to send me a photograph. A photograph was published in the JRAS. for 1868, p. 241, but it was not very good and is by now rather faded, so that it seemed worth while to reproduce this much better photograph from a different set of casts. The best hand-copy is still that in Westergaard's *Bundehesh* (1851).

---



THE HAJIABAD INSCRIPTIONS.



## VII

### MOSES B. SAMUEL, A JEWISH KATIB IN DAMASCUS, AND HIS PILGRIMAGE TO MEDINAH AND MEKKAH

By JACOB MANN

THE vicissitudes of a Jewish secretary, whom his master, an Emir in Damascus, compelled to adopt Islām and to accompany him on his pilgrimage to Medinah and Mekkah, are described in a number of skilfully wrought Hebrew poems printed here for the first time. They are extant in two manuscripts, Oxford MS. Heb. f. 3 and 4 (see Neubauer-Cowley's *Catalogue of Hebrew MSS. at the Bodleian*, vol. ii, Nos. 2726<sup>2-4</sup> and 2766). They are designated as Karaite hymns (so on the backs of the binding), but have really no connexion whatever with this sect. The handwriting seems to be of the fourteenth century, but furnishes no conclusive evidence.

The author, Moses b. Samuel, a native of Safed and the aforesaid Katib, depicts his experiences in five poems having in all 134 strophes. Each of the latter consists of three rhymed hemistichs, while the fourth is a Biblical verse ending in לי. In addition each strophe begins with a letter of either the alphabet or the author's acrostic. Poems i, iii, and v are alphabetical, while No. ii has the acrostic "I Moses b. Rabbi Samuel", and No. iv begins "I Moses b. Rabbi Samuel, who requests full forgiveness from God, who preferred the faith of Moses and Israel". Ultimately our poet returned to his former religion and, as an erstwhile convert, asked for Divine pardon. The first poem was preceded by an introductory composition of three strophes with the acrostic "Moses". This as well as the first sixteen strophes of poem i are missing. The conclusion of the work (מהברת) forms a piyyuṭ of

thanksgiving wherein the metre is employed (No. VI). The acrostic is "Moses b. Samuel of Safed".

As the poems are translated here, it is only necessary to give a summary of our author's story. A deputation waited upon the Caliph (in Cairo), in the presence of the members of the Diwān, and read before him a petition advocating a number of restrictions against "the people of the tribute" (i.e. Jews and Christians). The ḳadis and the ulemas were summoned to give their opinions as to what the Prophet's attitude was towards this part of the population. The viceroy (Wezīr) advocated that no Jew or Christian should be allowed to attain any dignity or authority in the State and none of them be employed as katibs. Moreover, the following restrictions should be imposed upon them: that they wear certain marks in the baths, put on no beautiful garments, raise not their voices in the houses of worship, while their women should not expose any jewellery. The Caliph agreed, and the Secretary of the Diwān was ordered to draw up the corresponding edicts. This took place in the month of Ab. The decrees were despatched to all provinces, and during the next month (Elul) reached Damascus, where our Moses acted as katib to an Emir. He was commissioned to supervise the concerns of his master in the Damascus district, and thus moved in a purely Muslim environment. When the new treatment of "the people of the tribute" became known, the attitude of the other subordinates of his master towards him completely changed. A certain David Hakkohen in Fustāṭ, evidently also a government official, seems to have been compelled to adopt Islām. Moses returned to Damascus in the month of Tishri and spent the festival of Tabernacles in constant fear of the fate about to overtake him. On the eighth day of the festival he was arrested and brought before the Emir and his brother. Two witnesses gave specious evidence that he spoke disrespectfully of the ruling religion. As a result, he seems to have

been tortured and was dangerously ill for three months. Other Jews were similarly treated. After his recovery our poet was forced to renounce Judaism and continue to act as katib to his master. Thereupon the latter resolved to make a pilgrimage to Mekkah, taking with him all the members of his household. In vain did Moses attempt to evade this enforced religious ceremony by pretending that his recent illness forbade him to undertake such an arduous journey. He was compelled to join the Emir's company, and the interesting account of his pilgrimage, written with a superb sarcasm, testifies to the author's state of mind while outwardly performing the rites of the hajj. During the journey Moses resolved to rid himself of his employment as secretary with a view of being able to return to his former faith. Circumstances helped him when his master incurred the Caliph's wrath and was banished, together with his brother, to Aleppo. But subsequently the Caliph visited Damascus, when the Emir and his brother took the opportunity of waiting upon their sovereign and regaining his favour. They succeeded and our poet was again threatened with a hard taskmaster. He poured out his soul in prayer in the famous synagogue of Jaubar, near Damascus, in the cave said to have been used by Elijah the prophet. Also in the Ark, where the scrolls of the Law are kept, Moses deposited a petition to God. Now when the Emir was restored to his former dignity, he asked Moses to resume his services as katib. But the latter refused by maintaining that he had taken an oath at the Prophet's tomb in Medinah no more to serve in that capacity. Thereupon his master ordered him to be tortured. But while giving this command he had a stroke and expired after an illness lasting for seventeen days. Thus our poet was finally delivered from a cruel fate. He no doubt returned to his former religion. But whether he could do this in Damascus or had to flee the country is obscure. So far no more is known of his life-story.



A general persecution against "the people of the tribute" in Egypt and in Syria during the reign of the Fāṭimid Caliphs (A.D. 969–1171) only occurred under al-Ḥakim. But this ruler is nowhere reported to have visited the capital of his Syrian dominion. Moreover, the name of the chief katib, "the secretary of the secret" (סופר הסוד = *السّر*, poem ii, l. 16), makes it evident that the poems date from the post-Fāṭimid period (see note 29). It was during the reign of the Mamlūk Caliphs in Egypt that the restrictions against Jews and Christians were from time to time renewed. A serious time for the tributary population was the year A.D. 1301, when several of the laws mentioned in our poems were enforced all over the empire. These were carried out in Rajab, 700 H. (April, 1301), in Cairo, and in the following month (Shabān) in Damascus.<sup>1</sup> These dates do not correspond with those given in the poems, which must therefore deal with events that took place at some other time. Already in Shabān, 689 H. (August–September, 1290) an order was issued by the Caliph Ḳalā'un forbidding any Jew or Christian to be employed in the administrative offices of the Government, and the holders of such appointments to be dismissed.<sup>2</sup> A more critical emergency occurred a short time later during the reign of Ḳalā'un's son al-Ashraf Khalil. Maḳrizi<sup>3</sup> reports how the haughty attitude of a Christian katib to an Emir in Cairo towards a Muslim official resulted in a riot of the Muslim population. The Caliph proclaimed in the capital that no Jew or Christian should be allowed to remain in the employment of an Emir. At the same time he commanded all Emirs to propose to their Christian secretaries to adopt Islām under the threat of death. Probably the same alternative was put before

<sup>1</sup> See *Journal Asiatique*, sér. iv, tom. xviii, 486–7; Weil, *Geschichte des Abbasidenkalifats in Egypten*, i, 269 ff. A Hebrew account is given by Sambari in Neubauer, *Mediaeval Jewish Chronicles*, i, 135–7.

<sup>2</sup> See Quatremère, *Histoire des Sultans Mamlouks*, ii, pt. i, 109.

<sup>3</sup> Wüstenfeld, Macrizi's *Geschichte der Copten*, 71 ff.

the Jewish katibs, and these events are reflected in the poems discussed here. One of these compelled converts was David Hakkohen in Cairo, while the same fate overtook Moses b. Samuel in Damascus. But, of course, no definite conclusion as to the date can be arrived at, since the beginning of poem i is missing, wherein very likely the time of these happenings was fully indicated. Let us hope that the lacuna may yet be discovered.

## I

(Bodl. 2766, fol. 1, recto.)<sup>1</sup>

ויקראו האגרת לפניו	"פגעו המלך יושב עם נבונים	
כל מחשבותם לי <sup>2</sup>	וישמע המלך ותימנע בעיניו	
ויתן באנשי המס <sup>3</sup> ממשלתם	"צדק המלך משאלותם	
האומרים לי <sup>4</sup>	ישומו על עקב בשתם	
והיו להשיבו נכונים	"קראו לשופטים ולנבונים	5
ויודעים האזינו לי <sup>5</sup>	ויאמר שמעו מאמינים <sup>6</sup>	
מה דבר בענינם הנביא <sup>7</sup>	"ראו זאת האגרת וענו בי	
והמה חושבים לעשות לי <sup>8</sup>	ויען כל אחד מהם כלביא	
כי אתה איש תחכמוני	"שמע המלך אדוני	
ויורני ויאמר לי <sup>9</sup>	וכך דבר המשנה פלוני	10
בצרור החיים אם יהיה לעזרה <sup>10</sup>	"תהי נפש המלך צרורה	
עמדה אחוך שמע לי <sup>11</sup>	לדברי המשנה בנבורה	
נשלם אלפא ביתא		

## II

(verso)

אני משה בן רבי שמואל <sup>12</sup>	
אל יהי בתוכינו מהם גדולים	"אמר <sup>13</sup> כי אנשי המס נבלים
גם כח ידיהם למה לי <sup>15</sup>	ולא בעלי אימה <sup>14</sup> כישמעאלים
שלא יהיו מהעול רקים	"נרבה עליהם החקים
אעננו עמדות לי <sup>17</sup>	ודתינו השקר נקים <sup>16</sup>
ושלמותיהם אל יהיו נאות	"יעשו להם במרחצים אות
מי אשר חטא לי <sup>19</sup>	וכל אחד ממצנפתו <sup>18</sup> יכרות

(From here complete in Bodl. 2726, fol. 5, recto.)<sup>20</sup>

וינצלו עדי נשיהם שידעו <sup>22</sup>	"ממלאכת הספרות <sup>21</sup> כלם ימנעו
ומה שגיתי הבינו לי <sup>23</sup>	ובתפלתם קוליהם אל ישמעו
ויהי כאיש שתה שכור וגמר <sup>24</sup>	"שמע המלך המאמר

- 10 כל ממלכות הארץ נתן לי<sup>25</sup> ויען את העם ויאמר  
 כי דתיהם שונות מכל עם "העם הזה נכניעם  
 למען ייטב לי<sup>26</sup> ונודע בגוים זרעם  
 והשמיעו במדינות ובערים "במהרה כתבו ספרים  
 ואתם תהיו לי<sup>28</sup> ואל יחסר מכל הדברים  
 15 והוא היה בזאת העצה יסוד "נקרא לפניו סופר הסוד<sup>29</sup>  
 כאשר עוללת לי<sup>30</sup> ויאמר לו כתוב והחזיק מאד  
 כי נשמעה עצתם להשפיל ולבזות "רצו ויצאו בפנים עזות  
 ראה יי כי צר לי<sup>31</sup> העם יכופר עונם בזאת  
 כי הוא חדש בכיה וצוחה "בחדש החמישי<sup>32</sup> נהיתה האנחה  
 20 כי שנאה אנכי ויתן לי<sup>33</sup> לא יש לנפש בו רוחה  
 וכלל הסופרים קרא "ישב סופר הסוד הנקרא

(verso)

- הלא אמר לי<sup>34</sup> ויאמר כתבו כדבר המלך מהרה  
 ויכתבו מהרה הספרים "שמעו כלם הדברים  
 בעבור זה עשה יי לי<sup>35</sup> כי אלהים שופט משפיל ומרים  
 25 ויחתום בטבעת המלך כאשר קשב "מיהר בספרים ועבר ושב  
 הוגד הוגד לי<sup>37</sup> כי הוא איש נכבד ונחשב  
 "אלדמשק עירי הניעו בחדש הששי הספרים אשר בם מוקשי  
 מרשת זו ממנו לי<sup>38</sup> ותבער בלבי אשי  
 שיבאו ויעשו וישמעו "לכנוס אנשי המס קבעו  
 30 כי רבים לוחמים לי<sup>39</sup> ויבואו ויכנעו

## III

אלפא ביתא שניה

- סופר בלב שלם ושוב רחשון<sup>40</sup> "אני הייתי בראשון  
 כן הנחלתי לי<sup>41</sup> עם קצין רשע בעל לשון  
 להלך עריו וצוני "בטרם הניעו הספרים נחני  
 (fol. 6, recto)  
 לך אסוף שלי כי חנני "לך אסוף שלי כי חנני  
 5 עת הניע מאמרי להלל "גם במדעך מלך אל תקלל<sup>43</sup>  
 תנה בני לבך לי<sup>44</sup> דתך ולאחרים סודך אל תמלל  
 עם נעריי לכפרים וחלקתי<sup>45</sup> "דבריו שמעתי והלכתי  
 ולילות עמל מנו לי<sup>46</sup> ויוסותו דרכי כי נסכלתי  
 ובשמעם העצה הרחיבו פיהם "הייתי בתחלה עמם כהם  
 10 אויבי יאמרו רע לי<sup>47</sup> לא יאבה יי סלוח להם  
 ומכוס החימה נמלא גביעי "ויגע החדש השביעי  
 דבר פי בצר לי<sup>48</sup> וירחק ממני דודי ורעי

"זלעפה אחזתני מרשעים  
במצרים לדוד הכהן בן שעשועים  
15 "חבורות היו בלבי  
וחרשים חרשו על גבי<sup>61</sup>  
"מנתי הכאב ולא יכולתי  
כי הגידו לי הוה נהיה<sup>49</sup> בנעים  
ותהי לחרפות לי<sup>60</sup>  
ויחמו מעי בקרבי  
ופחד יצחק היה לי<sup>62</sup>  
מפני צרי אשר עמם הלכתי

(verso)

אבל כלתה רוחי ונכנעתי  
"ידעתי כי פתחו עלי עיניהם  
20 דאבקש לברוח מחמת מעשיהם  
"כבשתי כעסי עד המדינה  
ונחבאתי ולא הלכתי אנה ואנה  
"לחעתיר אל אלהי נכנסתי  
ושאלתי רחמי אלוהי ואמרתי  
25 "ממך אשאל סתר רעם  
דאעבוד את י' בנועם  
"נכנע לבבי לפניך  
ולתפלתי פקה עיניך  
60 "סמר בשרי ורעדה אחזתני  
30 וחרעה אשר מצאתני  
"עד ליל שמיני עצרת התחננתי  
והשלמתי התפלה ונרדמתי

(fol. 7, recto)

הבקר היה ואני נתפשתי  
"פלני מים ירדו עיני<sup>63</sup>  
וגם אנשי ונשי וביתי  
35 "צר ומצוק מצאוני  
כי פחד פחתי ויאתייני  
"קרא אותי הרע והרשע  
ויען וינחום וישתעשע  
"רשעו הוסיף עלי וידבר עזות  
40 הדת ישמעאל אתך לבזות  
"שני עדים בני בלעל<sup>64</sup>  
ויעידו עלי מרם אעל  
"תם עוני ובא הקץ  
וזמן הרע אותי ליחץ  
ולא בינת אדם לי<sup>62</sup>  
כי לא שמע תפלתי אדני  
לשמע און ישמעו לי<sup>64</sup>  
ואל אדוני ואחיו הרשעם הביאוני  
ואשר יגורתי יבוא לי<sup>65</sup>  
אחי אדוני אשר כמה פשע  
ויאמר הנישה לי<sup>66</sup>  
הן היתה כזאת  
אשר תאמר או לי<sup>67</sup>  
הוציאם במרד ובמעל  
לאויבים היו לי<sup>68</sup>  
ונהייתי בנוים כמטרה לחץ  
כאשר עשה לי<sup>70</sup>

## IV

אני משה בן רבי שמואל . השואל תשובה שלמה מאל .  
הבחר בדת משה וישראל<sup>71</sup> .

(verso)

<p>הביטו וראו אחי בני אמי ואבי אשר עולל לי<sup>72</sup> בשנים ועשרים יום לחדשי אם רשעתי אללי לי<sup>73</sup> ויעשפו באיש חוזק ובכל המונו י' קראתיך חושה לי<sup>74</sup> נשאוני אל ביתי בחולי רע כאשר עשו לי<sup>75</sup> מכאבי נחלה מכתי כה יעשה י' לי<sup>76</sup> ואשמע שמועה רעה אל לבי כי מר לי<sup>77</sup> כי חוז על חוז ושמועה אל שמועה<sup>78</sup> י' יחשוב לי<sup>79</sup></p>	<p>"אותי עשק והגדיל כאבי אם יש מכאוב כמכאובי "נוקשתי ביום קדשי ויסר עמרת ראשי "ירא י' ממעונו אשר הוסיף רשעו וזדונו "מפרע<sup>75</sup> אשר בי נפרע ולבי תחת בגדי נקרע "שלש חדשים היתה מחלתי ושאלתי מצורי שיקבל תשובתי "החולי היה בקרבי כי נגע באחי אשר נגע בי "בשמעי צעקתי צעקה רעה ועיני כל ורוחי ענה (fol. 8, recto)</p>
<p>כי אלהי הטאי לי שמר לב טהור ברא לי<sup>81</sup> והתלאה אשר מצאה לי ולאחי מה זאת עשית לי<sup>83</sup> אל תשגני צורי ממצותיך עד שוב אפך תשית לי<sup>85</sup> בתשובה אשר אליך תשיבני אז ינוח לי<sup>86</sup> השיבני ואשובה אליך אשר אני אחזה לי<sup>88</sup> ומתדומות חשכונם<sup>89</sup> העלני אל יעלצו אויבי לי<sup>90</sup> זכרה לי אלהי לטובה גם זאת זכרה לי<sup>91</sup></p>	<p>"נכנע לבבי ובשרי סמר ואתפלל אל י' ואומר "ראה אלהי כי נכנעה רוחי ואיך יהיה זה ואתה מבטן אמי נוחי<sup>82</sup> "בכל לבי אלהי דרשתיך כי בלבי צפנתי אמרתיך<sup>84</sup> "יהי נא חסדך לנחמני ותשית לי חק ותזכרני "שוב אלי ברחמיך אלמדה פושעים דרכיך<sup>87</sup> "מעול הנזים הצילני ובחסדך הגדול תנחמני "ועד זקנה ושיבה וישועתי תהיה קרובה (verso)</p>

"אחר הדברים האלה פקד האל ומחליי היה לי גואל

90 ויתן לי כח ואיל  
 "לכן<sup>98</sup> ננע לבי לא סר  
 ואומר איך שנאתי מוסר  
 "השיבני הקצין לספרותי  
 ויגדלני בהוציאי מדתי  
 85 "שלום דבר וזהה לי למחתה  
 ויאמר לי אתה עתה  
 "ויעל על לבו כי ילך למכות<sup>97</sup>  
 וידבר אלי דברים רכות  
 "אמר לכל חילו להזיותם נכונים  
 לחנוג במכות המונים  
 40 "לבחיריו אמר וזהה בלבי החשב  
 ואחי<sup>101</sup> לבטח יושב

(fol. 9, recto)

"תקן חפציו וצרכיו  
 וישלח אלי בעד מלאכיו  
 45 "שמע ממני ולך עמי  
 כי כמוד כעמי  
 "ויבאו עבדיו אלי  
 ואצעק גדולי ואלי<sup>105</sup>  
 "בקצין אדוני שאלוהו  
 ולא יוכל ללכת ובביתו הניחאו  
 50 "השיבוהו הדבר ויחר אפו  
 ויאמר הביאוהו עד פה  
 "שלח אלי אחד מאלי  
 ויאמר אלי מהר אמור אלי

(verso)

55 "לדבר אלי תשוב<sup>112</sup>  
 אתה אתו ישיש וחשוב  
 "מיהרתי להלך בלא לבי  
 ויאמר הנה התלת בי  
 "היום הזה אחדש צרותיך  
 60 ולא להלך אל ביתך<sup>115</sup>  
 "משריו הפקיד עלי  
 ויאמר לקרובי לנבוע אלי  
 "אל אור הבקר אסף עבדיו  
 ויסעו כלם יחדיו

- 65 כי כאבי נעצר בקרבי <sup>119</sup> "ללכת אם בלא לבי  
כל ראי ולעינו לי <sup>120</sup> וברב עוני לפני צורי ומשגבי  
(fol. 10, recto) <sup>121</sup>
- והלכנו ממדינה אל מדינה  
ומעיר אל עיר  
עד אשר עברנו אל הר שעיר  
באתי אל מדינת נביאם <sup>128</sup>  
ויחשבו כי הוא שומעם ורואם  
ויתקבצו החונגים אל בית  
קבורתו <sup>126</sup>  
זאמר לי אחד מעדתו  
"חשתי לקרא אחד מאנשי המדינה  
השבעה באלהים הנה  
רץ <sup>180</sup> לדבר שמע האמת בלא  
שקר  
רק באלה הימים לא יראה כי  
הוא יקר <sup>181</sup>  
"ברחוב זה המקום סביבי  
להיות האור נונה על הנביא  
דבריו שמעו אנשי עירו  
ויוחק עליהם ויאמת דברו  
"תהלת י' ידבר פי  
ואשתחוה על אפי  
"מדברו ערב ללבי כי הוא קשה  
וזכרו מפני כל האומות לא ינשה  
"שם ישבו שלשת ימים  
ואלך עמם שנים עשר יום  
משמים  
"הגיעו אל בית עבודתם <sup>140</sup>  
זאתבונן באבן השחור  
הדוחה אותם  
"ויחזנו וינעו כשכור <sup>148</sup>  
אלה בחטאתם אל תמכור <sup>144</sup>  
"יצאתי משם והם מרבים חניגה
- והלהב בלבי מבוער  
כל ראי ולעינו לי <sup>122</sup>  
70 ויתפללו עליו <sup>124</sup> בצאתם ובבואם  
צחק עשה לי <sup>125</sup>  
ויראו בלילה אור נונה על  
מנורתו <sup>127</sup>  
המקנא אתה לי <sup>128</sup>  
ושאלתי אותו האור מאנה  
אם תשקור לי <sup>129</sup>  
75 כי אור נביאינו בלילה כמו בקר  
וחן לא יאמינו לי <sup>182</sup>  
כל אחד בידו לפיד אש מוציא  
ומביא  
אשר מקדישים לי <sup>183</sup>  
ויקומו להרגו ולאררו  
(verso)
- 80 בני נכר יתכחשו לי <sup>184</sup>  
כי הביא לי זה האיש לנקיון כפי  
אשר המה י' לי <sup>185</sup>  
זאומר ולא קם נביא עוד בישראל  
כמשח <sup>186</sup>  
כי ברית עולם שם לי <sup>187</sup>  
85 וילכו אל מכות יחפים וערומים <sup>138</sup>  
לולי י' עזרתה לי <sup>189</sup>  
אשר ישימו פניהם אליו בתפלתם <sup>141</sup>  
כננע נראה לי <sup>142</sup>  
כי אמרו מנהג נביאנן נעשה ונזכור  
המלך אל יחשוב לי <sup>145</sup>  
90 זאומר י' קנא לשמך ולתורתך  
הנפונה <sup>146</sup>

והסר מלבינו הדאנה  
(fol. 11, recto)

147 האלה אשר נתתה לי  
והשב לו כבודך וקרנותיו רומם  
148 ואנשי קודש תחיון לי  
וביתך חרב ואנחנו רחוקים מעליו  
כי היית מחסה לי 149  
אני ועמך השוממים  
נפלאתה אהבתך לי 151  
והנה עתה בחטאתי נלכדתי  
כי לעולם היא לי 152

95 " שים פניך על מקדשך השמים  
ועמך השפלים גבוהים תשימם  
100 " ראה זה הבית והבאים אליו  
והשיבנו לשכון בצללי  
" אגורה באהלך עולמים 150  
כי אתה בחרת בנו מכל העמים  
לעשות רצונך אלוה חפצתי  
100 ומקדם אמרתך שמרתי

## V

153 אחר זה נסענו מחר כראן 154  
155 אנחנו ואנשי המדינה אשר דירך  
אשמם אשר ישיבו לי 156  
ערומים בשרנו עם ראשינו  
קדש יהיה זה לי 158  
(verso)

5 " נמלני אלוה טובה ולא נלה סודי  
וישיבני בשלום ולא עזבני בארץ  
נודי  
" דרך ארצם שבו אשר בה הלכו  
160 ואשובה אל קרובי אשר תמכו 161  
" הודאה ושבח לאל נתתי  
אזי אשלם את אשר נדרתי 10  
" ולא אעשה עוד מלאכת הספרות  
עדי אצא מעבדות לחרות  
" זאת שאלתי מצור עולמים  
ויצילנו מבין העממים  
15 " חסדו הטח אנני אלי ויקצוף  
על אדוני  
ואשב אני ובריתי שוקט על מכוני וישב י' לי 167  
" טוב י' לקיו לנפש תדרשנו 168  
הנמצא תמיד למבקשנו  
(fol. 12, recto)

" עלי בכל יום אשחרנו ואדרשנו  
" יצא אחרי זה המלך מארצו  
ויבא אל ארצנו לעשות חפצו  
169



על קצין צר בא קצו  
 "כשמוע אדוני ואחיו שבו מצובה  
 ויאמר להם לכו לפני באהבה  
 "לבי מזאת נחלה ונהיה  
 בקשתי לפניו במערת החביה  
 "מלכי ראה כי נצב אדוני על  
 מתכונתו  
 אלהי הצילה נפש<sup>174</sup> ממלכותו  
 "נתתי האגרת בהיכל<sup>176</sup>  
 ואמרתי ידעתי כי כל תוכל

(verso)

"סוף כל דבר המלך את ראש  
 אדוני הרים  
 ויבקשני לחלוק על עבדיו הערים  
 "עניתיו ויכנע לבבי

כי בזאת המלאכה נפשי לא  
 אביא  
 "פניו נשא לעבדיו ויסבו אלי  
 להרבות קשי מעללי  
 "צורי השפילו בעת הדבר מפיו  
 עלה

וישליכהו אל תהום ומצולה  
 "קבל תפלתי אל נורא ואיום  
 ויתן לי אלהי ממנו פדיום  
 "רחום בוחן לבבות וכליות

(fol. 13, recto)

הוא בחסדו יציל שארית השיות  
 "שיר ושבח אתן לך כל ימי  
 אשאל ממך לחמי ומימי  
 "תבענה שפתי תהלה  
 והנחלתני תורתך המעולה

כמלת בעון אתע<sup>180</sup> והפיטו הזה אמרובעל המחברת משה בן שמואל צפתי<sup>191</sup>

## VI ( — — — — — )

תָּמִיד עָדִי שׁוּבִי לְאַדְמָתִי	"מִלְכִּי בָךְ שְׁבָרִי וְתִקְוֹתִי
בְּאֲשֶׁר עֲנִיתִנִּי בְשׁוֹעֲתִי	"שִׁירִי יְהִי רְצוֹנִי לִפְנֶיךָ
דּוֹרָשׁ מְלִיחָתְךָ לְחַטָּאתִי <sup>102</sup>	"הִנֵּה אֲנִי עֹמֵד בְּדֹל שׁוֹאֵל
שָׁהִם בְּכָל עֵת סוֹכְבִּים אוֹתִי	"בְּמָה אֶקְדֶּם אֶת חֲסִדֶּיךָ <sup>103</sup>
כִּי אֶת לַעְזֹר לִי בִצְרָתִי	"נָגַד קָחַל עִמּוֹךְ אֲחֻלְלֶךָ
מִכָּל חֲסִדֶּיךָ וְנִכְלָמָתִי	"שָׁפַל אֲנִי צַעִיר וְקַטָּנוֹנִתִּי
חָרַד וְנִם מְוֹאֵת נִקְלּוֹתִי	"מִזֶּה אֲנִי נִבְחַל וְהִיִּיתִי
אָבִי וּבְמָה עַד הָלוֹם בָּאתִי <sup>104</sup>	"וְאוֹמְרָה מִי הוּא אֲנִי מִבֵּית
אוֹתִי לְתֵקֶן אֶת נְתִיבֹתִי	"אֶמְרוּ בְנֵי שׂוֹכֵל וְנִם עָנִי
הָאֵל וְשִׁמְעָתִי וּבִינּוֹתִי	"[וְ] . . . . . ה מִדּוֹת
הַתְּמִיד <sup>105</sup> הַלִּיכּוֹתִי בַּחֲמָתִי <sup>106</sup>	"[וְ] . . . . . אֲשֶׁר אֶסֹּף עָלַי רֹאשִׁי
תִּשְׁמַע וְתִרְצֶה אֶת עֲתִירָתִי	"פָּנִי נָשָׂא כָּל עֵת אֲשַׁחֲרֶךָ
תְּהִיָּה לְסִתֵּר לִי עָדִי מוֹתִי	"תִּתְמוֹךְ אֲשׁוּרֵי עַל גְּתִיב יוֹשֵׁר
מִלֵּא בְּרַחֲמֶיךָ <sup>7</sup> שְׂאֵלֹתִי	"יְהִי לְרִצּוֹן כָּל תַּפְלוֹתִי
	כִּי ל אִו תִּישׁוּ לִבֵּע <sup>108</sup>

## NOTES

<sup>1</sup> The vocalization of this MS. is peculiar; often a Pataḥ stands for a Segol, Hiriḳ for Kameṣ, and Kameṣ for Sheva. <sup>2</sup> MS. has here between the strophes קִינּוֹת, Lamentations, i.e. the last hemistich is taken from Lam. iii, 60. Similar indications are to be found throughout the poems. <sup>3</sup> "Ahl al-dhimma," the people of the tribute, viz. Jews and Christians. <sup>4</sup> MS. תַּהֲלִים, i.e. Ps. xl, 16.

<sup>5</sup> Muslims!—MS. reads נִבּוֹנִים; but corrected on the margin 'צח' = צח' (صحیح, correct). <sup>6</sup> MS. אִיּוֹב, i.e. Job xxxiv, 2.

<sup>7</sup> Muhammed. <sup>8</sup> MS. עֲזָרָא, i.e. Neh. vi, 2.

<sup>9</sup> MS. מְשָׁלִי, i.e. Prov. iv, 4. <sup>10</sup> "May the king die if he (Muhammed) be a help," i.e. the Prophet is certainly not in favour of the infidels.

<sup>11</sup> MS. אִיּוֹב, i.e. Job xv, 17. <sup>12</sup> This is the acrostic of the following poem. <sup>13</sup> He (the Wezīr) said. <sup>14</sup> "People of fear," i.e. exercising authority.

<sup>15</sup> MS. אִיּוֹב, i.e. Job xxx, 2. <sup>16</sup> The rhyme demands here the reading נִקְיִים, but נִקְיָם is more suitable for the sense, i.e. we shall carry out the demands of our religion by

oppressing the non-Muslims. Of course **השקר** is an ironical insertion by the author. <sup>17</sup> MS. **איוב**, i.e. Job xxxi, 36. <sup>18</sup> Turban.

<sup>19</sup> MS. **תורה**, i.e. Ex. xxxii, 33. <sup>20</sup> This MS. is not vocalized.

<sup>21</sup> The office of Katib. <sup>22</sup> "Who are married," cf. e.g. Gen. xix, 8. <sup>23</sup> Job vi, 24. The indication **איוב** is missing in our MS., but not so in Bodl. 2766. Here ends the Wezir's speech (**משנה**).

<sup>24</sup> "And he decided," cf. the expression **נמנו ונמרו**. <sup>25</sup> In our MS. **דברי ימים**, i.e. 2 Chron. xxxvi, 23. <sup>26</sup> In Bodl. 2766 **תורה**, i.e. Gen. xii, 13. <sup>27</sup> Here begins fol. 2, recto, in Bodl. 2766. <sup>28</sup> In Bodl. 2766 **תורה**, i.e. Ex. xix, 6. <sup>29</sup> "The confidential secretary."

Kalkashandi ("Geographie und Verwaltung von Ägypten," transl. Wüstenfeld in *Abhandlungen der Göttingen Königl. Gesellsch. der Wissenschaften*, vol. xxv, 217), in describing the various government officials during the Fātimid period, writes: "Of the officials in close touch with the Caliph the first in order was the Katib **الدست**, now called **Katib السسر**, who had a monthly salary of 150 dinars, while each of his assistants received 30 dinars." One of the most eminent Katibs used to be the holder of this office and was consulted by the Caliph in most instances (ibid., pp. 188-9). Kalkashandi died in 824 A. (A.D. 1421). <sup>30</sup> In Bodl. 2766 **קינות**, i.e. Lam. i, 22.

<sup>31</sup> In Bodl. 2766 **קינות**, i.e. Lam. i, 20. <sup>32</sup> Ab. <sup>33</sup> In 2766 **תורה**, i.e. Gen. xxix, 33. <sup>34</sup> In our MS. **תורה**, i.e. Gen. xx, 5. <sup>35</sup> MS. **תורה**, i.e. Ex. xiii, 8. <sup>36</sup> Here begins fol. 2, verso, in Bodl. 2766.

<sup>37</sup> MS. **רות**, i.e. Ruth ii, 11. <sup>38</sup> MS. **תהלים**, i.e. Ps. xxxi, 5. <sup>39</sup> MS. **תהלים**, i.e. Ps. lvi, 3. <sup>40</sup> "Intention," cf. Ps. xlv, 2.

<sup>41</sup> MS. **איוב**, i.e. Job vii, 3. <sup>42</sup> MS. **תורה**, i.e. Gen. xxxiii, 11. Bodl. 2766, fol. 2, verso, ends here. Between fols. 2 and 3 there is a gap. <sup>43</sup> Cf. Eccl. x, 20. The whole strophe seems to be the

continuation of the instructions given to our author by his master, who advised him to be careful in his remarks and not to discuss the question of Islām versus Judaism. For **מאמרי** probably read **מאמרו**, while **להלל** is either a euphemistic expression for **לקלל** (see, e.g., Job ii, 9) or read **לחלל**. Thus, "Do not curse the king in thy thought when his command goes forth to profane thy religion, and tell not others thy secret." <sup>44</sup> MS. **משלי**, i.e. Prov. xxiii, 26. <sup>45</sup> "And I spoke smooth words" (usually in the Hiphil, see, e.g., Prov. vii, 5), i.e. made myself popular with them. <sup>46</sup> MS. **איוב**, i.e. Job vii, 3.

<sup>47</sup> MS. **איוב**, but should read **תהלים**, i.e. Ps. xli, 6. <sup>48</sup> MS. **תהלים**, i.e. Ps. lxvi, 14. <sup>49</sup> Cf. Ps. cxix, 53, Ez. vii, 26. <sup>50</sup> MS. **תהלים**, i.e. Ps. lxix, 11.

<sup>51</sup> Cf. Ps. cxxix, 3. <sup>52</sup> MS. **תורה**, i.e. Gen. xxxi, 42. But the meaning is different here, viz. I had a great fear similar to that of Isaac when about to be sacrificed. <sup>53</sup> MS. **תהלים**, i.e. Ps. lxxi, 10; omit **רע**. <sup>54</sup> MS. **תלים**, i.e. Ps. lv, 9. <sup>55</sup> MS. **תלים**, but

should read **איוב**, i.e. Job xxxiii, 27. <sup>56</sup> MS. **תלים**, i.e. Ps. xxxi, 10.

<sup>57</sup> Cf. Ps. lxxxi, 8, Is. xxvi, 20. <sup>58</sup> MS. **תלים**, i.e. Ps. xxxii, 7.

<sup>59</sup> MS. **תלים**, i.e. Ps. xvii, 6. <sup>60</sup> Here begins Bodl. 2766, fol. 3, recto.

<sup>61</sup> MS. **תלים**, i.e. Ps. xxx, 11. <sup>62</sup> MS. **איוב**, but should read **משלי**, i.e. Prov. xxx, 2. Here the meaning is that the author was distracted owing to his arrest. <sup>63</sup> Cf. Lam. iii, 48. <sup>64</sup> MS.

**תהלים**, i.e. Ps. xviii, 45. <sup>65</sup> MS. **איוב**, i.e. Job iii, 25. <sup>66</sup> MS.

**תורה**, i.e. Gen. xxvii, 25. <sup>67</sup> MS. **קהלת**, i.e. Eccl. xii, 1; for **אז** read **אין**. The allusion is better understood by the sequence in the verse **אין לי בהם חפץ**, i.e. I have no desire for Islām. <sup>68</sup> Here

begins Bodl. 2766, fol. 3, verso. <sup>69</sup> MS. **תלים**, i.e. Ps. cxxxix, 22.

<sup>70</sup> MS. **משלי**, i.e. Prov. xxiv, 29.

<sup>71</sup> This is the acrostic of the following poem. Bodl. 2766 reads **מאֵל צח' (= צחיה) תשובה שלמה לאל**.

<sup>72</sup> MS. **קניות**, i.e. Lam. i, 12. <sup>73</sup> MS. **תלים**, but correct **איוב** in Bodl. 2766, i.e. Job. x, 15. <sup>74</sup> MS. **תלים**, i.e. Ps. cxli, 1. Here ends Bodl.

2766, fol. 3, verso. Between fols. 3 and 4 there is a gap. <sup>75</sup> **פרע**

is here = **פורענות**, punishment. Our author was apparently tortured.

<sup>76</sup> MS. **תורה**, but should read **שופטים**, i.e. Jud. xv, 11. <sup>77</sup> MS.

**רות**, i.e. Ruth i, 17. Here in a different meaning, "May God do so to me," i.e. accept my repentance. <sup>78</sup> MS. **רות**, i.e. Ruth i, 13.

<sup>79</sup> Cf. Ezek. vii, 26. <sup>80</sup> MS. **תלים**, i.e. Ps. xl, 18.

<sup>81</sup> MS. **תלים**, i.e. Ps. li, 12. <sup>82</sup> Cf. Ps. xxii, 10-11. <sup>83</sup> MS.

**תורה**, i.e. Gen. iii, 13, without **לי**. <sup>84</sup> Cf. Ps. cxix, 10-11. <sup>85</sup> MS.

**איוב**, i.e. Job xiv, 13; note the continuation **חך ותוכרני** <sup>86</sup> MS.

**איוב**, i.e. Job iii, 13. <sup>87</sup> Cf. Ps. li, 15. <sup>88</sup> MS. **איוב**, i.e. Job

xix, 27. <sup>89</sup> "Their darkness," i.e. perverse faith. <sup>90</sup> MS.

**תלים**, i.e. Ps. xxv, 2.

<sup>91</sup> MS. **עזרא**, i.e. Neh. xiii, 22. <sup>92</sup> MS. **תלים**, i.e. Ps. cxvi, 2.

<sup>93</sup> **לכן** is used here as the strophe has to begin with a Lamed. The meaning requires here "yet" (**ובכל זאת**), i.e. though he recovered the wound of his heart was not gone. <sup>94</sup> MS. **מנלה**, i.e. Esther

v, 13. <sup>95</sup> MS. **דניאל**, i.e. Dan. iv, 33. <sup>96</sup> MS. **תלים**, i.e.

Ps. xxxv, 14. <sup>97</sup> A not flattering play of words upon Mekkah!

<sup>98</sup> MS. **שיר השירים**, i.e. Cant. viii, 1. <sup>99</sup> MS. **שופטים**, i.e. Jud.

xviii, 4. <sup>100</sup> "I (only) listen about the journey," but shall not make it.

<sup>101</sup> MS. **וירי**. <sup>102</sup> MS. **שמואל**, i.e. 2 Sam. iii, 35. <sup>103</sup> MS.

**מלכים**, i.e. 2 Kings v, 7. <sup>104</sup> MS. **איוב**, i.e. Job xxxiii, 33. But

here for **אין** read **אין** as a threat is implied, i.e. "if you do not listen to me", then you will be punished. <sup>105</sup> "My great and mighty (lords),"

cf. 2 Kings xxiv, 15. <sup>106</sup> MS. **תורה**, i.e. Gen. xxiii, 8. <sup>107</sup> MS.

**שופטים**, i.e. Jud. xiv, 13. But this does not give a satisfactory

meaning here. <sup>108</sup> MS. **איוב**, i.e. Job xxiii, 5. <sup>109</sup> Read **בעל**.

<sup>110</sup> MS. **שמואל**, i.e. 1 Sam. iii, 6.

<sup>111</sup> From here begins Bodl. 2766, fol. 4, recto. <sup>112</sup> MS. **ותשוב**;

Bodl. 2766 **תשוב**. <sup>113</sup> MS. **תורה**, i.e. Gen. xxvii, 13. <sup>114</sup> MS.

**שופטים**, i.e. Jud. xvi, 15; for **הודיה** read **הגדת**. <sup>115</sup> So in Bodl. 2766;

MS. **ביתך**. <sup>116</sup> MS. **תורה**, i.e. Ex. xxiii, 33. <sup>117</sup> MS. **שמואל**,

i.e. 1 Sam. xii, 23. Note the continuation **מחש אל י**, viz. to make voluntarily the pilgrimage. <sup>118</sup> MS. **תורה**, i.e. Gen. xlv, 17.

<sup>119</sup> Connect with the end of the preceding strophe, i.e. the author's master warns him not to show any lack of zeal during the pilgrimage; the second person (**לך**, **לבך**) would be more suitable were it not for the requirements of the rhyme. <sup>120</sup> MS. **תלים**, i.e. Ps. xxii, 8.

<sup>121</sup> Fol. 4, verso, in Bodl. 2766. <sup>122</sup> See note 120. <sup>123</sup> Al-Medinah, where Muhammed is buried. <sup>124</sup> **עליו**, "for him," and not **אליו**, is exact. About the act of blessing the Prophet at al-Medinah, see

Burton, *Personal Narrative of a Pilgrimage to al-Madinah and Meccah* (York Library Edition, 1906), i, 313, n. 4. <sup>125</sup> MS. **תורה**, i.e. Gen. xxi, 6.

<sup>126</sup> The Hujrah, see loc. cit., 314 ff. <sup>127</sup> The minaret over the tomb. Burton, loc. cit., 316, writes, "Above the Hujrah is the Green Dome, surmounted outside by a large gilt crescent, springing from a series of globes. The glowing imaginations of the Moslems crown this gem of the building with a pillar of heavenly light which directs from three days' distance the pilgrims' steps towards al-Madinah." See also p. 334. <sup>128</sup> MS. **תורה**, i.e. Num. xi, 29.

<sup>129</sup> MS. **תורה**, i.e. Gen. xxi, 23. <sup>130</sup> This reading is better than the imperative **רוץ** in Bodl. 2766.

<sup>131</sup> Not in our MS., but in Bodl. 2766. <sup>132</sup> MS. **תורה**, i.e. Ex. iv, 1.

<sup>133</sup> MS. **תורה**, i.e. Lev. xxii, 2; after **אשר** supply **הם**. Here ends Bodl. 2766, fol. 4, verso. There is a gap between fols. 4 and 5.

<sup>134</sup> MS. **תלים**, i.e. Ps. xviii, 45; **יתכחשו** in the parallel 2 Sam. xxii, 45.

<sup>135</sup> MS. **מלכים**, but where? <sup>136</sup> Deut. xxxiv, 10. <sup>137</sup> MS. **שמואל**, i.e. 2 Sam. xxiii, 5.

<sup>138</sup> A pilgrim on approaching Mekkah has to divest himself of his garments and don the sacred robe, ihram. He may wear neither shoes nor boots, but sandals are permitted. The head, arm, and shoulder of the pilgrim are exposed. See Burton, loc. cit., ii, pp. 138-9. The journey from al-Medinah to Mekkah took this traveller also twelve days (August 31 to September 11, 1853).

<sup>139</sup> MS. **תלים**, i.e. Ps. xciv, 17. <sup>140</sup> The ka'abah containing the "Black Stone".

<sup>141</sup> The Kiblah.

<sup>142</sup> MS. **תורה**, i.e. Lev. xiv, 35. <sup>143</sup> The allusion is here to the ceremony of seven circumambulations round the Black Stone, see Burton, loc. cit., 165 ff. <sup>144</sup> Cf. Is. i, i.

<sup>145</sup> MS. **שמואל**, i.e. 2 Sam. xix, 20. <sup>146</sup> Cf. Hab. i, 4. <sup>147</sup> MS.

**מלכים**, i.e. 1 Kings ix, 13. <sup>148</sup> MS. **תורה**, i.e. Ex. xxii, 30.

<sup>149</sup> MS. **תלים**, i.e. Ps. lxi, 4. <sup>150</sup> Ps. lxi, 5.

<sup>151</sup> MS. שמואל, i.e. 2 Sam. i, 26. <sup>152</sup> MS. תלים, i.e. Ps. cxix, 98, cf. v. 67. <sup>153</sup> Here begins a new poem which is alphabetical.  
<sup>154</sup> What mountain is meant here is not clear. On the eighth day of the pilgrimage the celebrants leave Mekkah for Minah and on the following day proceed to the sacred mount "Arafat" (Mount of Recognition). One of the rites connected with the Hajj is to ascend the Mount as-Safa and run seven times from its top to the summit of Mount al-Marwah (see Hughes, *Dictionary of Islam*, p. 157, col. 1). Perhaps our author gave a nickname to one of these sacred spots by calling it "the mount of dung" (כראן = خِرَان), especially since Mount as-Safa can be translated "Mount of Purity". A similar change of names we have in the case of the Church of the Holy Sepulchre in Jerusalem, whose name "Kanisat al-Kiyama" (resurrection) was turned by the Arabs into "Kanisat al-Kumamah" (dung-heap). See Le Strange, *Palestine under the Moslems*, 141, note. <sup>155</sup> This word is not clear to me. Perhaps a town Ashar Diran (?) is meant.  
<sup>156</sup> MS. תורה, i.e. Num. xviii, 9. <sup>157</sup> Here begins Bodl. 2766, fol. 5, recto. <sup>158</sup> MS. תורה, i.e. Ex. xxx, 30. <sup>159</sup> MS. תלים, i.e. Ps. liv, 6. <sup>160</sup> As is well known, a pilgrimage to Mekkah is for the Muslim a highly meritorious act.

<sup>161</sup> Bodl. 2766 reads בי תמכו. <sup>162</sup> MS. תורה, i.e. Gen. xviii, 12. Here, of course, the meaning is, "after the wear and tear of the long journey I had a rest." <sup>163</sup> MS. שמואל, i.e. 2 Sam. vii, 14, where God says this about David. But here the author means, "And He will be unto me (as my God)." <sup>164</sup> MS. תלים, i.e. Ps. xviii, 21. <sup>165</sup> Cf. Ps. ci, 6. <sup>166</sup> MS. מלכים, i.e. 2 Kings xx, 8. Bodl. 2766, fol. 5, verso, begins here. <sup>167</sup> MS. תלים, i.e. xviii, 25. <sup>168</sup> Lam. iii, 25. <sup>169</sup> MS. תלים, i.e. Ps. xxii, 3. <sup>170</sup> MS. ירמיה, i.e. Jer. xxxi, 26.

<sup>171</sup> MS. תורה, i.e. Ex. xix, 5. <sup>172</sup> This famous synagogue, situated at Jaubar, a village near Damascus, was visited by the Karaite traveller Samuel b. David (A.D. 1641-2), who writes (in Gurland, *בני ישראל*, i, 22): והלכנו משם (מדמשק) ובאנו אל כפר אחר קרוב לדמשק וזיבד ושם בית הכנסת ישן מוזמן קדמון . . . ובתוכו בצד ימין ההיכל מתחת ההיכל מערה א' קטנה יפה מאד והיא מערת אליהו ע"ה אשר אמר (לו) יי קום לך מדברה דמשק (1 Kings xix, 15) וירדנו במערה וקראנו כל עניניו ובקשות כל איש לעצמו. Another Karaite traveller, Moses b. Elijah (A.D. 1654-5), writes (loc. cit., 41): והוליכו אותנו גם כן למקום אחד שמו גובאר ושמה כנסת טובה ויפה מאד . . . ואומרים זו כנסת אליהו הנביא ז"ל ובתוך הכנסת מערה קטנה שתרד אליה (אליה) במדרגות והיא יפה מאד ומדליקים שמה נרות עששיות תלויות בשמן זית ושמה התפללנו עם הבחורים והנכבדים מקהל (אליה) במדרגות והיא יפה מאד ומדליקים שמה נרות עששיות תלויות בשמן זית ושמה התפללנו עם הבחורים והנכבדים מקהל דמשק אשר באו שמה עמנו. See also about this synagogue Kremer,

*Mittelsyrien u. Damascus*, 171, and Benjamin, *Eight Years in Asia and Africa*, 64-6. The latter wrongly identifies this Jaubar synagogue with the two synagogues in Damascus, the one said to have been built by Elisha and the other by R. Eli'esar b. 'Azarya (or R. El'azar b. 'Arak). Also the **כנישתא דאבי ניבר** (Ber. 50a) was no doubt in Babylon and should not be confused with the Jaubar synagogue. The famous Rabbi Isaiah Horowitz, who left Prague in 1621 for Palestine, writes in a letter to his children (printed in the Hebrew periodical **שומר ציון הנאמן**, Nos. 141-2), after describing his visit to Aleppo, Homs, and Damascus, **ובקהילות הנ"ל בכל בית הכנסת חדר של אליהו ז"ל**, and **ובדמשק חדר בתוך מערת (מערה) אשר שם אליהו הנביא נחבא** (r. **מערה**). **וזה עורבים מביאים לו לחם ובשר וערין החדר ק"ם תורה**, <sup>173</sup> MS. only, i.e. Gen. xv, 2. <sup>174</sup> So MS., but Bodl. 2766 reads **הצילני** only.

Read here **נפשי**. <sup>175</sup> MS. **תלים**, i.e. Ps. lv, 9. <sup>176</sup> Into the Ark, where the Holy Scrolls are kept. <sup>177</sup> MS. **תלים**, i.e. Ps. iv, 2. <sup>178</sup> MS. repeats the last two words, but correctly in Bodl. 2766 **תורה**, i.e. Gen. xlv, 17. <sup>179</sup> MS. **תורה**, i.e. Num. xi, 15; the allusion becomes evident by the continuation of the verse **הרגני נא הרג**. <sup>180</sup> In Bodl. 2766 **ויאמר אליהם**.

<sup>181</sup> MS. **תלים**, i.e. Ps. xviii, 19. <sup>182</sup> MS. **והתננע**, but correct in Bodl. 2766. <sup>183</sup> MS. **תלים**, i.e. Ps. xviii, 25. <sup>184</sup> MS. **תורה**, i.e. Gen. xxx, 6. <sup>185</sup> Read **הציל**. <sup>186</sup> **תלים**, i.e. Ps. cxxii, 1. <sup>187</sup> MS. **מלכים**, i.e. 1 Kings xx, 4. <sup>188</sup> MS. **תלים**, i.e. Ps. xxx, 12. <sup>189</sup> Before this word the margin in Bodl. 2766 reads (in a later hand) **וסך כל הבתים האלה מאה ארבעה** 'ושלשים והסימן עליהם הלא על כי אין אלהי בקרבי מצאוני הרעות' (Deut. xxxi, 17); the numerical value of the dotted letters is 134. Now poems i (incomplete), iii, and v are each alphabetical, hence consisting in all of (22 × 3) 66 strophes. No. ii has 15 strophes, while No. iv consists of 50; in all 131. Probably at the beginning of poem i there was a short exordium of three strophes with the acrostic **משה**. <sup>190</sup> = **אללה תעאלי**.

<sup>191</sup> The last four words form the acrostic of the following poem. <sup>192</sup> This line is missing in Bodl. 2766. <sup>193</sup> MS. **חסדך**, but the metre demands **הַסְדִּיךְ**; cf. also the following plur. **שָׁהם**. <sup>194</sup> Bodl. 2766, fol. 6, verso, ends here; no more preserved. <sup>195</sup> MS. **התמיד**. <sup>196</sup> MS. **בחימתי**; the allusion is to Job xxix, 6, where **חמה** = **חמאה**. <sup>197</sup> MS. **ברחמך**, but the metre demands the plural. <sup>198</sup> These abbreviations, forming the conclusion of the poem, are not clear to me.

## TRANSLATION

### I

... They found the king in the company of his wise men, and they read the letter before him. The king

heard and it pleased him. *All their thoughts are about me.*<sup>1</sup> The king approved of their petition and granted them authority over the people of the tribute. *Let them be desolate by reason of their shame that say unto me (Aha, Aha!).* The kādīs and the wise men (‘ulemas) were summoned, and they were ready to give answer to him (the king). And said he, “Hear ye, Muslims, and ye learned, give ear unto me. Behold this letter, and tell me what the Prophet said about them (the people of tribute).” And each of them answered as a lion, *intending to do me (mischief).* “Hear, my lord the king, for thou art a man of wisdom,” thus spoke the viceroy (Wezīr). *And he gave an opinion and said concerning me,* “By thy life that he (the Prophet) is certainly not in their favour.” Pay attention to the words of the Wezīr, forcibly delivered: *I shall instruct thee, listen to me.* (Completed is the (first) Alphabet.)

## II

Said he (the Wezīr): “The people of the tribute are vile; let none of them be great amongst us, nor have authority like Arabs. *Yea, the strength of their hands, whereto will it profit me?* Let us increase the laws upon them, so that they be not free from the yoke. And we shall establish our false religion, *bind it unto me as a crown.* Let them wear a sign in the baths, their clothes be not beautiful, and everybody cut off (a part) of his turban, *all that sinned against me.* Let all of them refrain from the work of Katib, their women to be deprived of their ornaments; and during prayers let them not raise their voices. *And wherein I have erred, give me to understand.*” The king heard the speech and became like a drunken man (i.e. strongly impressed). He decided and replied to the people: “*He (Muhammed) gave me all the kingdoms of the earth.* Now let us humiliate this

<sup>1</sup> The italics indicate the Bible verses at the end of the strophes.



people, for their laws are different from those of all other nations, and their seed is known among the peoples. *Thus it will be good unto me.* Let speedily the decrees be written and proclaimed in the provinces and the cities, and let nothing miss from all (my) words. *But as for you, (a holy nation) will ye be unto me.*" The confidential Katib was summoned, he that was the chief support of this intrigue, and he (the king) said to him, "Write and exert thyself greatly as thou hast planned<sup>1</sup> for me." They hastily left (the king) with arrogance, for their plan has been accepted to humiliate and make despicable, and thereby the people's transgression be atoned. *Behold, O God, for I am in distress.* In the fifth month (Ab) the (event causing) sighing happened, for it is a month of weeping and crying<sup>2</sup> (and) the soul has no relief in it. *Because I am hated, (God) gave unto me (this trouble).* The confidential Katib, who had been summoned, took his seat and called all the secretaries, and said, "Write quickly in accordance with the king's command; *has he not told me?*" All of them heard the instructions and they quickly wrote the edicts. For God is a judge that brings low and raises up, *therefore did God do this unto me.* He (the chief Katib) hurried on (the drawing up of) the decrees, and went about signing (them) with the king's seal as he was bidden (literally "as he listened"); for he is an important and respected man, (as) *I have been fully told.* In the sixth month (Elul) arrived at my city, Damascus, the decrees which formed my snare, and the fire burned in my heart, *on account of this net they hid for me.* It was fixed to assemble the people of the tribute, that they come, hear, and act (accordingly). And they came and surrendered, *for many fought against me.*

<sup>1</sup> עלל is taken here in the meaning of "plan", "intrigue". Cf. Rabbinic Hebrew עלילה, a pretext.

<sup>2</sup> i.e. mourning for the destruction of the Temple.

## III

I was at first a Katib, conscientious and well disposed, (in the employ) of a wicked Emir, a slanderer. *Such* (a lot) *was I made to possess*. Before the edicts arrived he (my master) guided me (i.e. instructed me) to make a tour over his towns, and he commanded me, "Go, collect what is mine, *for God favoured me and I have* (all). Yea, in thy thought curse not the king, when his command comes to disparage thy religion, and tell not others thy secret. *My son, give thy heart to me* (to my words)." I listened to his words and went with his servants to the villages, and spoke smooth words so that my ways were enticed, for I was foolish. *And nights of weariness were appointed unto me*. At first I was with them on equal terms, but on hearing of the intrigue they opened their mouth widely. May God not consent to forgive them, (viz.) *my enemies that speak evil against me*. The seventh month (Tishri) arrived and my goblet was filled from the cup of wrath. My friends and companions were removed from me *and my mouth spoke when I was in distress*. Fierce anger took hold of me when the wicked (fellows) told me that destruction was committed on the pleasant (person) in Egypt, David Hakkohen, the son of delight, *and* (that) *was my reproach*. Wounds were in my heart, and my bowels within me thrilled; plowers plowed upon my back *and I had the fear of Isaac*. I hid the pain, (however) I could not, on account of the foes with whom I travelled. But my spirit was spent, and I submitted *when my enemies said evil about me*. I knew that they opened their eyes on me, on account of the report that reached them, and I sought to flee on account of their deeds, *I would hasten my escape*. I restrained my anger till (my arrival in) the city (Damascus), and my companions passed on on one side and I on another, and hid myself, going nowhere, *but it profited me not*.

I entered (the synagogue) to beseech my God and set my heart to prayer, and I asked for the mercy of my God, saying, "*Be gracious unto me, O God, for I am in distress. From Thee do I ask cover for the storm, for a little while till the wrath passeth, and then shall I serve God in comfort. Thou art a protection to me. My heart is submissive before Thee, look down upon me from Thy habitations, and open Thine eyes for my prayer. Bend Thy ear unto me. My flesh crept and terror took hold of me on account of the report that reached me, and the evil that overtook me. O God, be a helper unto me.*" Till the night of the eighth day of the festival I made supplication, and having finished the prayer I fell asleep. When morning arrived I was caught *and I was distracted*. With rivers of water did my eyes flow because God did not hear my prayer, and also my household (wept) *at the report they heard of me*. Distress and oppression overtook me, and to my master and his brother, the wicked person, did they bring me, *for the thing I feared came upon me, and that I was afraid of reached me*. My master's brother, the bad and wicked who so often sinned, called me, and he raised his voice, roared, made sport, *and said, "Come near to me."* He increased his wickedness towards me, and spoke harshly, "Is it really so that thou didst despise the religion of Ishmael *when you told me 'I have no (pleasure in it)'*?" Two witnesses, sons of Beliya'al, he brought forward in rebellion and treachery; and they gave evidence before I entered (the room). *They became mine enemies*. My sin was complete and the end came; and I became among the Gentiles as a target for the arrow. The evil time oppressed me *by reason of what it did to me*.

## IV

("I, Moses b. Rabbi Samuel, who asks complete forgiveness from God who hath chosen the faith of Moses and Israel.")

He (that person) robbed me and magnified my pain. Look and see, my brethren, the children of my mother and father, *whether there is pain like mine which is done unto me*. I have been ensnared on my holiday, on the twenty-second day of my month (Tishri), and he removed the crown of my head. *If I be wicked, woe unto me*. May God see from His habitation, and judge this man and all his crowd, who increased his wickedness and arrogance. *O God, I called thee, hasten to me*. On account of the punishment meted out to me, they carried me to my house with a bad disease, and my heart was torn under my clothes, *by reason of what they did to me*. My illness lasted three months, on account of my pain my wound was grievous; and my request from my Rock (God) is that He accept my repentance. *May God thus do unto me*. While the illness was within me, I heard a report, evil to my heart, that what afflicted me did (also) my brethren, *for it is bitter unto me*. On hearing this I issued a despairing cry, for there is ruin upon ruin and (evil) report upon (evil) report. My eyes are consumed and my spirit afflicted. *May God reckon this unto me*. My heart is subdued and my flesh crept because my God kept my sin unto me. And I prayed unto God, and I said: "*A pure heart create unto me*. See, my God, that my spirit is subdued and (see) the trouble that overtook me and my brethren. And how should this be, (seeing that) thou hast taken me out from my mother's womb? *What is this Thou hast done unto me?* I have sought Thee, O my God, with all my heart. Do not cause me, O my Rock, to go astray from Thy commandments, for Thy saying have I stored up in my heart. *Until Thy wrath is passed, would that Thou appointest me* (a set time and rememberest me). May, I pray, Thy kindness comfort me with the repentance (by which) Thou wilt make me return unto Thee, and Thou wilt appoint for me a set time and wilt remember me; *then I will be at rest*. Return unto

me in Thy mercy, make me return and I shall return unto Thee. I will teach the transgressors Thy ways, *which I behold unto me*. Deliver me from the yoke of the Gentiles, and draw me out from the depths of their darkness; and in Thy great kindness console me. *May my enemies not rejoice about me*. And until old and hoary age remember, my God, (this) unto me for good, and may my salvation be near. *This also remember unto me.*"

After these words God visited (me) and was a redeemer unto me from my illness, and He gave me vigour and strength, *for He inclined His ear unto me*. Yet the affliction of my heart did not depart and pain was shut up within me. And I said, "How did I hate reproof *and all this availeth me not*." The Emir made me return to my secretaryship, perforce without my goodwill, and he raised (my rank) by making me forgo my religion. *And surpassing greatness was added unto me*. He spoke peace while being destruction unto me, and he enticed me with his words and he said unto me, "Thou art now *unto me as a friend, a brother*." And it came upon his heart to go to Mekkah, to perform the rites of a pilgrim and to weep there. And he spoke soft words unto me, "*Oh that thou wert as my brother!*" He commanded all his retinue to be ready, women, fathers, and sons, to perform the pilgrimage to Mekkah in crowds. *And thus hath he done unto me*. He commanded his chosen subordinates, and the thought was in my heart that I shall (only) listen about the journey and shall securely dwell (at home), *saying, "God do so unto me (if I make the pilgrimage)."* He (the Emir) prepared his matters and requisites so that there should be no mishap on his travels, and he sent to me through his messengers, *for he sought an occasion against me*. "Hear (the message) from me and go with me, thou and my men that visit my hall, for thou art like my people. *If thou dost not listen to me (thou wilt be punished).*" And his servants came to me and told his

words about me. Then I cried, "My great and mighty ones, *hear unto me and entreat for me* the Emir my lord, request him and say unto him, 'This man is ill and cannot travel; leave him (therefore) in his house.' *And ye give unto me* (an answer)." They (the Emir's servants) brought him back the reply, and his anger was kindled and he increased his wrath and indignation. And he said, "Bring ye him here; *I shall understand what he will say unto me.*" He sent unto me one of his officers, a man of deceit in his actions, and he said unto me, "Hasten, say unto him, '*Behold, I am here, for thou hast called me.*' Return to speak with him, then will his anger go back from thee, (for) thou art an elderly and respected person with him. *Hearken unto my voice and go (and) take me (with you).*" I hastened to go unwillingly, and when I reached him he sported with me, saying, "Behold, thou hast dealt deceitfully with me *and thou didst not tell me* (the truth). This day will I renew thy troubles and shall not let thee reach thy desire nor go (back) to thy house, *lest they make thee sin against me.*" He commanded (one) of his officers about me carefully to watch my doings, and he said to those near unto him to punish me (if I try to escape). *As for me, far be it from me* (to sin against the Lord).

At dawn he gathered his servants, and the men of his company and his friends, and they all travelled together. And he said, "*Far be it from thee* to travel unwillingly," for my pain was shut up within me, and owing to the greatness of my sin before my Rock and Stronghold, *all that saw me scoffed at me.* We went from province to province and from town to town, while the flame (of indignation) burned in my heart, till we passed Mount Sē'ir. *All that saw me scoffed at me.* I arrived in the town of their Prophet (Medinah), where they prayed for <sup>1</sup> him at arrival and departure, thinking that he heard and

<sup>1</sup> See note 124 to the text.

saw them. *Laughter hath he made unto me.* The pilgrims assembled at his tomb and beheld in the night a light shining over his Minaret. Said one of his assembly, "*Art thou jealous of me?*" I hastened to call one of the townspeople and asked him wherefrom (came) the light. *Swear by the god here that thou tell me no falsehood.* He hastened to speak the true report without falsehood. "The light of our Prophet is indeed alike by night and by day, only in these days it is invisible, for it is rare. *And if they believe me not,* (behold) in the street yonder everyone waves a torch in his hand in order that the light illumine (the tomb of) the Prophet *whom they sanctify unto me.*" When his townspeople heard his words they arose to kill and accurse him. But he had the better of them and verified his statement. *Oh the sons of the stranger speak falsely to me.* My mouth speaketh the praise of the Lord that He brought unto me this man for the purity of my hands, and I bowed down upon my face, *because He inclined (His ear?) unto me.* His speech is sweet to my heart, though it be severe. And I said, "And there arose no prophet again in Israel like Moses, and his memory shall not be forgotten from the mouth of all the nations, *for He hath set it unto me for an everlasting covenant.*"

There (at Medinah) they stayed three days and (then) went to Mekkah barefoot and naked, and I went with them for twelve days appalled. *Were not God a help unto me,* (I should have died). They arrived at the house of their worship (the mosque), whither they turn their faces at prayer. And I examined the Black Stone that causes them to stumble; *it appeared unto me as a plague.* And they reeled and moved about like a drunkard, for said they, "Let us follow and commemorate the custom of our Prophet." O God, abandon them in their sin. *Let not the King (God) impute (iniquity) unto me.* I went out from there (the mosque) while they increased the

festivity, and I said, "O Lord, be zealous for Thy name and Thy discouraged Torah, and remove from our heart this anxiety *which Thou hast given unto me*. Set Thy countenance upon Thy desolate sanctuary, restore to it Thy honour, and raise up its horns. As for Thy despised people, set them on high, *and holy men will ye be unto me*. Behold this house and those that visit it, while Thy house is desolate and we far from it. Make us return to dwell in its shade, *for Thou art a protection unto me*. May I dwell in Thy tent for ever, I and Thy desolate people, for Thou hast chosen us from all the nations; *wonderful is Thy love unto me*. To do Thy will, O God, I desired, and behold I am now caught in my sin. But I have kept Thy word before, *for it is to me forever*."

## V

Thereupon we journeyed from Mount aş-Şafa (?), we and the men of the town of Ashar Diran (?), and the men of the lands of Ishmael and Haran, *who rendered their guilt-offering unto me*. At midday we halted till sunset, while our bodies, together with the head, were naked. For they said, "This is our holy mountain." *Holy shall this be unto me*. My God requited me good and revealed not my secret, since He knew that I went involuntarily and without my intent; (thus) He brought me back in peace and did not forsake me in the land of my wandering. *Behold, God is a helper unto me*. They returned by the same way of their country which they took (before), they that said that they made me do a meritorious act which they did (too). And I returned to my relatives who supported (my hands); *after my hardship I had (a rest)*. To God I gave thanks and praise and asked for complete forgiveness from Him. Then shall I pay what I vowed, *and He will be my (God)*. I shall no longer do the work of a secretary, for its fear is engraved on my heart, till I go forth from slavery unto freedom; *He will render*



*unto me in accordance of the purity of my hands.* This is my request from the everlasting Rock, that I and my seed walk in the perfect way; and that He deliver us from among the nations: *for God will heal me.* In His kindness He inclined His ear unto me, (so that) the king was wrath with my master and expelled him to Aleppo, to do as was my will. And I and my household dwelt (in) quiet upon my base, *and the Lord requited unto me.* God is good to those that hope for Him, to the soul that seeks Him, ever to be found by him that asks for Him. I shall every day wait upon Him and seek Him, *and by night there will be no silence unto me.*

Thereupon the king left his country (Egypt) and came to our land to do his desire. (I thought that) the end has come upon the Emir, the foe, *and my sleep was pleasant unto me.* When my master and his brother heard (the news), they returned from Aleppo and stood before him (the king), who did much good to them. And he said to them, "Walk in attachment before me, *keep ye my covenant and ye will be mine.*" On account of this my heart was sick and sad and I entered the synagogue of the prophet Elijah. I prayed before Him (God) in the cave of hiding. "O my God, *what wilt Thou give unto me.* My King, behold my master standing in his (former) basis, and I fear lest he asks me to be with him. My God, rescue my soul from his trap. *I will hasten an escape unto me.*" I placed the letter in the Ark and prayed before God as much as I could, saying, "I know that Thou art able to do everything, *in distress Thou makest broad for me.*"

Finally the king exalted the head of my master and gave him a portion among the lords. Then he (my master) asked me to divide the management of the townlets among his servants, but *I said, "Far be it from me."* I answered him while my heart showed submission, "My master knoweth of my oath at the Prophet's grave that I shall not bring myself (again to do) this work.

*But if thou doest thus unto me (thou mayest kill me). Then he lifted up his face to his servants who surrounded me, and he said, "Bring him near unto me," in order to increase the severe (punishment) for my deed. But God was a support unto me. My Rock brought him low while the command came out from his mouth, and his body shivered and he became ill. He (God) cast him into the abyss and the deep, and and God requited unto me. God, tremendous and feared, accepted my prayer, and He killed him after seventeen days. My God granted me redemption from him. He heard my voice and gave unto me (as I wished). God, merciful and searching the hearts and kidneys, rescued the sheep from the lion's mouth. May He in His kindness rescue the remainder of the sheep. I rejoiced when they told me (the news). Song and praise will I render unto Thee all my days, for Thou didst deliver me from my enemies and foes. From Thee I ask my bread and water. Thine am I and what is mine. My lips utter praise, for thou didst save me in pity and compassion, and hast given me Thy superior Torah. Thou hast turned my lamentation into a dance unto me.*

## VI

(Completed by the strength of God, may He be exalted. The following piyyut said the author of the (above) work, "Moses b. Samuel of Safed") :—

My King, constantly are my trust and hope in Thee till my return to the earth. May my song be favourable before Thee as Thou hast answered me in my cry. Behold, I stand as a poor man asking and requesting Thy forgiveness for my sin. Wherewith am I to meet Thy kindnesses that surround me always? In the presence of the assembly of Thy people shall I praise Thee, for Thou art my help in my trouble. I am low, insignificant, and unworthy of all Thy kindnesses, so that I am ashamed.

On this account I was confused and trembled ; also I was yet more vile and said, " Who am I from my father's house, and wherewith have I come hither ? " Said sons of understanding and also replied unto me to set right my path " . . . the ways of God ". I heard and considered. . . . which I pour out upon my head, cause my walks constantly to be in comfort (literally " in butter " ) ; lift up my face whenever I beseech Thee ; hear and accept my request ; support my steps upon a path of uprightness ; be my protection till I die. May all my prayers be for a favour ; fulfil my request in Thy mercy.

---

## VIII

### THE LEGEND OF THE DIVINE LOVERS: ENLIL AND NINLIL

By THEOPHILUS G. PINCHES

IN the March issue of the *Proceedings of the Society of Biblical Archaeology*, 1911, I published a paper entitled "Enlil and Ninlil, the Older Bel and Beltis", one of a series of papers dealing with the gods of Babylonia from unnoticed or unusual points of view. In this contribution to the subject of Babylonian mythology appears, among other things, a transcription and translation of a British Museum tablet dealing with these deities as the "youthful hero and handmaid" of the Babylonian city of Niffur (Niffer, also, it is said, pronounced *Noufar*), identified by the Hebrews of Rabbinical times with the Calneh of the 10th chapter of Genesis.

My rendering of this inscription was accompanied only by a transcription and a few notes, without the cuneiform text. The publication of this last I have always felt to be desirable, and have had it constantly in my mind with the view not only of placing the original before the public, but also of revising my translation. In the meanwhile, however, Professor Stephen Langdon, of Oxford, has recognized one of the Sumerian inscriptions from Niffer, published by Professor Barton, of Bryn Mawr College, U.S.A., as being an archaic duplicate of the Babylonian text in the British Museum, and he is about to edit the whole, with numerous additions, in an American publication. Though unaccompanied by any Semitic rendering, and exceedingly mutilated, the original at Philadelphia has the great advantage of having been copied out before copyists' errors had corrupted the text. It is therefore more authoritative than the late Babylonian

copy, though the translation which the latter gives is invaluable as showing how the Semitic scribes, possibly about the time of Hammu-rabi, understood the original Sumerian text.

The legend, which occupied at least two tablets, has 16 Sumerian lines on the obverse and 23 on the reverse, with the Semitic rendering, 73 lines in all. The colophon describes it as being the first tablet (of the poem beginning) "In Dur-ana, their city", and adds that it had been written out "like its old copy", and that the tablet or series in question belongs to Šamaš-šum- . . . The style of the writing suggests the age of Esarhaddon and his successors on the Babylonian throne.

The language is that known as the *dialect* of Sumerian, and, though not uniformly employed in the Philadelphia copy, the name of the god appears as *Mullil* (or *Wullil*) instead of *Enlil*. Another pronunciation of *Enlil* is *Illil*, which, in Damascius, has been transcribed into Greek as *Illinos*.

#### INTERLINEAR TRANSCRIPTION AND TRANSLATION

1. Dur-an<sup>ki</sup> eri<sup>1</sup>-na-nam      am<sup>2</sup>-dur-ru-ne-en-ne-en.
2. *Ina mina āli-šu-nu šu-nu u-ši-ba.*  
In Dur-ana, their city, they dwelt.
3. Nipri<sup>ki</sup> eri-na-nam      am<sup>3</sup>-dur-ru-ne-en-en-en.
4. *Mina āli-šu-nu šu-nu u-ši-ba.*  
In Nippur, their city, they dwelt.
5. Dur-gišimmar eri-na-nam      am-dur-ru-ne-en-ne-en.
6. *Mina, āli-šu-nu šu-nu u-ši-ba.*  
In Dur-gišimmar, their city, they dwelt.
7. Id-sal-la      id azag-ga<sup>4</sup>-na-nam.
8. *Mina nār-šu el-li-tum-ma.*  
Id-salla is its holy river.


<sup>1</sup> In the Philadelphia text *eri* in lines 1, 3, and 5 is followed by *ki*.

<sup>2</sup> Variant: *na-an*.

<sup>3</sup> Var.: *na*.

<sup>4</sup> Var.: *bi*.

9. Kar-gištin-na kara-bi-na-nam.  
 10. *Mina kar-šu-ma.*  
 Kar-gistina is its quay.  
 11. Kar-ušar<sup>1</sup> kara ma-giša<sup>2</sup>-bi-na-nam.  
 12. *Mina ma-ak-lu-ti-šu-ma.*  
 Kar-ušar is its mooring-quay.  
 13. Tul-amar-uduk<sup>3</sup> tul a dug-ga-bi-na-nam.  
 14. *Nina bur me-e-šu ta-bu-ti-ma.*  
 Tul-amar-uduk is its well of sweet water.  
 15. Mul-nun<sup>d</sup> Bi-ir<sup>4</sup>-da pa mula-bi-na-nam.  
 16. *Mina pa-lug-šu mut-ta-an-bi-tum-ma.*  
 Mul-nun-Birdu is its shining brook.  
 17. Ip-ta-an-bu-i-ne-en u-ga-ta-am ga gara-bi-na-nam.  
 18. *Iš-še-da-ad u-bi-ta-a me-ri-eš-ta-šu ša-kin-tum-ma.*  
 There is brought the appointed produce of its  
 plantation.  
 19. <sup>a</sup> En-lil guruš tura-bi na-nam.  
 20. *Mina e-di-il-šu šiḫ-ru-um-ma.*  
 Enlil is its young hero.  
 21. <sup>a</sup> Nin-lila ki-el tura-bi na-nam.  
 22. *Nin-lil ar-da-as-su ši-ḫi-ir-tum-ma.*  
 Ninlil is its young maiden.  
 23. <sup>a</sup> Nun-bar-še-gun-nu um-ma-bi-na-nam.  
 24. *Mina bur-šum-ta-šu-ma.*  
 Nun-bur-še-gunnu<sup>5</sup> is its matron.  
 25. Ū-bi-a<sup>6</sup> ki-el azaga ama  
 u-gu-a-ni ša-na mu-un-di-di.  
 26. *I-na á-mi-šu mina um-ma a-liḏ-ta-ša iš-šar-ši.*  
 At this time *kiel-azaga*,<sup>7</sup> the mother her begetter  
 encourageth her.

<sup>1</sup> Var. : *a-sar*.<sup>2</sup> Var. : *giš ma-giša*.<sup>3</sup> Thus, according to my copy, but the Philadelphia text has , *lal*, "honey"—"the honey well."<sup>4</sup> The B.M. text has *Bi-ni-du*.<sup>5</sup> Given in line 28 as *Nissāba*, the grain-goddess (generally spelled *Nisaba*).<sup>6</sup> Variant: *á-ba*.<sup>7</sup> "The holy maiden."

27. <sup>a</sup> Nin-lil <sup>a</sup> Nun-bar-še-gun-nu ša-na mu-un-di-di.

28. *Mina ni-is-sa-a-ba iš-šar-ši.*

Ninlil—Nissāba encourageth her.

29. Hid azag-ga nu-nuz-e hid azag-ga

a-nam mi-in-tu-tu

30. *I-na na-a-ri el-li-ti sin-niš-tu<sup>m</sup> mina me-e at<sup>1</sup>-[ta-ab-bu-uk?]*

In the holy river the woman of *hid-azaga*<sup>2</sup> maketh the water flow.

31. <sup>a</sup> [Nin-lil hid azag-ga] nu-nuz-e

hid [azag-ga] a-nam mi[-in-tu-tu.]

32. [*Mina i-na na-a-ri el-li-ti sin-niš-tu<sup>m</sup> mina me-e it-ta-ab-bu-uk.*]

For Ninlil in the holy river the woman of *hid-azaga*<sup>2</sup> maketh the water flow.

At this point the British Museum tablet breaks off, and the Philadelphia copy varies. This I give here as the restored continuation and

RENDERING BASED ON THAT OF PROFESSOR STEPHEN  
LANGDON.

16. <sup>a</sup> Nin-lil-li gu hid nun-bi-ir-du nam-mi-in-gubu-de.

Ninlil on the bank of the canal *Nun-birdu* standeth.

17. I-ne azag-ga-am u-mu-un i-ne azag-ga i-ne-ba-ši-bar-ri.

With pure eye the lord of the pure eye gazeth upon her.

18. Kur-gal a-a <sup>a</sup> Mu-ul-lil i-ne azag-ga-am i-ne-ba-ši-bar-ri.

The great mountain, father Enlil, with pure eye gazeth upon her.

19. Siba-na-ne nam-tar tar-ri i-ne azag-ga-am i-ne-ba-ši-bar-ri.

Her shepherd, who declareth fate, with pure eye gazeth upon her.

<sup>1</sup> Perhaps a mistake for *it[tabuk]*.

<sup>2</sup> "The holy river."

20. A- . . hu-lam-mu-bi-am tur-turše-a-am mi-su-ub-bi.

The . . . with his . . . the little with grain enricheth.

21. Sab hul-a šib-gub šab gi ma-lala<sup>1</sup>-na-am mu-un-di-ni-ib-šub-šub.

The joyful one(?) with gladness of heart his sail has set.

22. . . . . mu-un-ni-in-ri-ga mu-uš-tug mu-na-ši-em.

. . . . . that which has been arranged I have heard and seen.

23. Hid azag-ga-am nunuz-e hid azag-ga-am im-ma-ni-tu-tu.

In the holy river the woman of the holy river maketh the water flow.

24. <sup>a</sup> Nin-lil-li gu hida gu nun-bi-ir-du i-im-gubu-de.

Ninlil on the bank of the canal, the bank of the *Nun-birdu*, stood.

25. Ine azag-ga-am lugal-e ine-azag-ga-am ine-im-ma-ši-in-bar.

With pure eye—the king with pure eye gazed upon her.

26. [Kur-gal a-a] <sup>a</sup> En-lil ine azag-ga-am ine-im-ma-ši-in-bar.

[The great mountain, father] Enlil, with pure eye gazed upon her.

27. [Siba-na-n]e nam-tar tar-ri ine azag-ga-am i-ne-im-ma-ši-in-bar.

[Her shepherd], he who declareth fate, with pure eye gazed upon her.

28. . . . . bi-e huš mu-na-ab-bi nu-da-ra-ši-ib-še-gi.  
. . . . . he spake—he was not gracious to her.

29. . . . . li-ne bi-e huš mu-na-ab-bi nu-un-da-ra-ši-ib-še-gi.

. . . . . he spake—he was not gracious to her.

<sup>1</sup> *Gi má-lala* is explained by *gan málalē*, “reed of ship-suspending”—probably indicating the motive-power. Perhaps a mast, but “rattan sail” is probably better.





## THE LEGEND OF THE DIVINE LOVERS

*Text of the British Museum Fragment*

80-11-12, 484. Reverse.

[illegible]

<sup>2</sup>Seq-qa (𐎧𐎱𐎠𐎺) again written and erased.

30. . . . . ra-am . . . nu-mu-un-zu.  
       . . . . . knew not.
31. . . . . -ra-am se-su-ub mu-un-zu.  
       . . . . . to atone knew.
32. . . . . lu-mu he-sig-gi.  
       . . . . . my . . . let me strike (?).
33. . . . . šu-tub-bi mu-e-en.  
       . . . . . of that garment (?) am I.
34. . . . . -mu me-e ba-na-šilig-gi.  
       . . . . . my . . . I have ordained (?) for her (?).
35. . . . . gu-mu-na-de-e.  
       . . . . . I proclaim.

*9205, Obverse II*

(Lines 1-8 wanting)

9. Lugala . . . . .  
    The king . . . . .
10. Giša-bi na-mu-un-dug ne-bi na-mu-un-su-ub.  
     He had not accomplished his love—in this wise he  
 kissed her not.
11. A-a <sup>a</sup> En-lil mal (?) gi . . . . .  
     Father Enlil . . . . .
12. Giša-bi na-mu-un-dug ne-bi na-mu-un-su-ub.  
     He had not accomplished his love—in this wise he  
 kissed her not.
13. Ur-ura-na šu-ni ba-an- . . . -m[a (?) -ma ?].  
     In his reverence his hand he withheld (?).
14. Giša-bi na-mu-un-dug ne-bi na-mu-un-su-ub.  
     He had not accomplished his love—in this wise he  
 kissed her not.
15. Ki-dur-a tur-ra-šu im-ma-da-ab-na-en.  
     In the dwelling for a space he resteth.
16. Giša-bi na-mu-un-dug ne-bi na-su-ub.  
     He had not accomplished his love—in this wise not  
 kissing.

17. Giš-aš dug-ga-ni giš-aš su-ub-ba-ni.

One embrace (was) his accomplishing, one embrace his kissing.

18. A <sup>a</sup> Zu-en-na . . . . . šab mu-na-ni-di.

Sighing (for) Sin . . . . hath encouraged him.

19. <sup>a</sup> En-lil ki-uru im-ma-ni-in-gubu-we (?).

Enlil setteth foot in the palace.

20. <sup>a</sup> En-lil ki-uru dib-dibi-da-ni.

Enlil in the palace hath been installed.

21. Dingir-galgala ninnū-ne-ne.

The 50 great gods.

22. Dingir nam-tar-ra imin-na-ne-ne.

The 7 gods of fate.

23. <sup>a</sup> En-lil ki-uru im-ma-ni-tug-ga-ne.

Cause Enlil to dwell in the palace.

24. <sup>a</sup> En-lil u-sug-gi eri-ta ba-ra-ê.

(*Enlil, musugqu ina āli līšē.*)

Enlil, let the votary (? of Ištar) depart from the city.

25. <sup>a</sup> Nu-nam-nir u-sug-gi eri-ta ba-ra-ê.

(*Nu-namnir, musugqu ina āli līšē.*)

Nu-namnir, let the votary depart from the city.

26. <sup>a</sup> En-lil ni-du <sup>a</sup> Nin-li-li ni-uš.

(*Enlil illak, Ninlil iriddē.*)

Enlil cometh, Ninlil followeth after.

27. <sup>a</sup> Nu-nam-nir ni-du ki-el mu-un-[sar-ra <sup>1</sup>].

(*Mina il-lak mina u-ra-ad-da-ad.*)

Nu-namnir cometh, the handmaid followeth.

28. <sup>a</sup> En-lil-li mulu ka-gala-ra gu-[mu-un-na-an-de-e].

(*Enlilli ana ša ābulli išesi.*)

Enlil to the man of the great gate calleth :

29. Mulu ka-gala mulu <sup>giš</sup> si-gar-ra.

(*šā abulli, šā šigari.*)

"Man of the great gate, man of the bar.

<sup>1</sup> So Professor Langdon.

30. Mulu giš šu-di-eš mulu giš si-gar azag-ga.  
*(ša mēdili, ša šigari elli.)*  
 Man of the lock, man of the holy bar.
31. Nin-za <sup>a</sup>. N[in-lil]-li i-im-du.  
*(Ninlilli belit-ka illaka.)*  
 Thy mistress N[inli]l cometh."
32. Ud-da li-mu mu-ra-tara-na.  
*(Šumma ana šumi-ia iša'il-ka.)*  
 If one ask concerning me.
33. Za-e ki-mu nam-mu-ni-in-pad-de-[en].  
*(Atta āšri lā tukallam-šu.)*  
 Thou shalt not reveal to him my whereabouts.
34. <sup>a</sup>. Nin-lil-li mulu ka-gala-[ra] gu-[mu-un-na-an-de-e].  
*(Ninlilli ana ša ābulli išesē.)*  
 Ninlil calleth to the man of the great gate :
35. Mu-lu ka-gala mu-l[u giš si-gar-ra].  
*(Ša ābulli, ša šigari.)*  
 "Man of the great gate, man of the bar.
36. Mu-(lu) giš šu-di-eš mu-lu [giš si-gar azag-ga].  
*(Ša mēdili, ša šigari elli.)*  
 Man of the lock, man of the holy bar.
37. <sup>a</sup>. Mu-ul-lil u-mu-[un-zu i-im-du].  
*(Bel-ka, Enlil, illaka.)*  
 Enlil, thy lord, cometh."
38. <sup>a</sup>. En-lil-li mulu ka-gala-[ra gu-mu-un-na-an-de-e].  
*(Enlilli ana ša ābulli išesē.)*  
 Enlil to the warden of the great gate calleth :

(About 6 lines are wanting here. They repeated in part lines 28 ff., above, as follows:—)

39. "Man of the great gate, man of the bar—
40. Man of the lock, man of the holy bar—
41. Thy mistress, Ninlil, cometh.
42. mulu Ki-el ne-en šag-ga-ra      ne-en mul-la-ra  
*(Ar-da-tu ki-a-am dam-qat      ki-a-am na-ba-a-at)*  
 The maiden who is so pure, so brilliant.

- 42a. Mulu giša-na e-dug                      mulu im-su-ub-su-ub  
 (Man-ma-an a(y)a-ir-*li*-e-ši    a(y)a-iš-ši-iq-ši)  
 Let no man defile her, let no man kiss her—
43. <sup>a</sup>. Nin-lil ne-en šag-ga-ra                      ne-en mul-la-ri  
*Mina = Nin-lil ki-a-am dam-qat ki-a-am ba-na-at*  
 Ninlil so pure, so brilliant.”
45. <sup>a</sup>. En-lil-li šag-ga bar-ra mu-un-da-ab-dug.  
 Enlil pleasant things in secret spake.

*Reverse, Col. I*

1. . . . . gi . . . . . mu . . . . .
2. <sup>a</sup>. Mu-ul-lil u-mu-un kur-kur-ra . . . . .  
 Enlil, lord of the lands . . . . .
3. <sup>a</sup>. Mu-ul-lil u-mu-un-zu ni-me-dim . . . . .  
 Enlil, thy lord, like one who is (?) . . . . .
4. Ud-da nina-mu me-en-ne tuga-zu šu-mu ne-tag-tag.  
 At the time my lady resteth, thy robe shall my  
 hand not touch.
5. A u-mu-un-zu a lah-lah-ga ša-ma ni-gal.  
 The seed of thy lord, the most holy seed, in my  
 heart shall be.
6. A <sup>a</sup>. Zu-en-na a lah-lah-ga ša-na ni-gal.  
 The seed of Sin, the most holy seed, in my heart  
 shall be.
7. A lugala-mu ana-šu he-du a-mu ki-šu he-du.  
 May the seed of my king go to heaven, may my  
 seed go to earth.
8. A-mu a lugala-mu-dim ki(?) -šu hi-im-ma-du.  
 May my seed, like the seed of my king, go to  
 the earth.

(About 18 lines are worn away.)

27. . . . . na kul(?) . . . . .
28. <sup>a</sup>. Mu-ul-lil u-mu-un-mu ine-ba-da-an-bar.  
 Enlil, my lord, looked upon thee.
29. <sup>a</sup>. Mu-ul-lil u-mu-un-zu ni-ib-dimine-ba-da-an-bar(?).  
 Enlil, thy lord, like a lover (?) looked upon thee.

30. Ud-da nina-mu me-en-ne tuga-zu šu-mu ʔe-tag-tag  
At the time my lady resteth, thy robe let my hand  
touch.

31. A u-mu-un-zu a laḥ-laḥ-ga ša-ma ni-gala.  
The seed of thy lord, the most holy seed, in my  
heart exists.

32. A <sup>d</sup>.Zu-en-na a laḥ-laḥ-ga ša-ma ni-gala.  
The seed of Sin, the most holy seed, in my heart  
exists.

33. A lugala-mu ana-šu ʔe-du a-mu kia-šu ni-du.  
The seed of my king, to heaven may it go—my  
seed to earth may it go.

34. A-mu a lugala-mu-dim kia-šu ʔi-im-ma-du.  
My seed, like the seed of my king, to earth may it go.

35. <sup>d</sup>.En-lil-li lu hid kur-ra-dim da ga-na-nad.  
Enlil, like the man of the river of the land, may he  
lie down.

36. Giš in-ma-ni-in-dug ne-en im-ma-ni-in-su-ub.  
He hath accomplished (his) love, in this way he  
kissed her.

37. Giš aš dug-ga-ni giš-aš su-ub-ba-ni.  
One embrace (was) his accomplishing—one embrace  
his kissing.

38. A <sup>d</sup>.Nin-a-zu lagala-šu giša-mus . . . ša mu-[na-an-  
di-di ?].

The seed of Nin-azu unto the king, my embrace  
encourageth.

39. <sup>d</sup>.En-lil ni-du. <sup>d</sup>.Nin-lil in-ni[-uš].  
Enlil cometh, Ninlil followeth.

40. <sup>d</sup>.Nu-nam-nir ni-du ki-el mu-un-[šar-ra].  
Nu-namnir cometh, the maiden followeth after.

*Reverse, Col. II*

1. . . . -mu, . . . . my . . .

2. [Nina-zu <sup>d</sup>.Nin-lil-li i]-im-du.  
[Thy mistress, Ninlil, c]ometh.

3. [Ud-da li]-mu mu-na-tar-ri.  
[If anyone] ask with regard to me.
4. [Za-e ki]-mu nam-mu-ni-in-pad-de.  
[Thou] shalt not reveal my [abode].
5. . . . giš má a-siga-bi giš pad-rim-a-ra <sup>a</sup>. Nin-lil  
im-ma-te.

. . . . her ferryboat to the *pad-ri-ma* of Ninlil he  
brought near.

6. Lugal(?) giš má a-siga-bi giš pad-rim-a-ra gi.  
The king her ferryboat to the *pad-ri-ma*.
7. . . . lil u-mu-un . . . . ku-ma-e-ne(?) . . . . -ab(?).  
[En(?)]lil the lord . . . . .
8. [<sup>a</sup>. En-lil]-li mu-lu si-lu-?-e gu-mu-ni-ib-gi-gi.  
Enlil, who returned word to him of the bar(?).
9. Mu[-lu ?] šag-šag-ga šag-ga ba-ra mu-da-ab-dug,  
He who favoureth, spoke to her in kindness—
10. <sup>a</sup>. En-lil-li šag-šaga šag-ga ba-ra mu-da-ab-dug.  
Enlil, (who) favoureth, spoke to her in kindness.
11. . . -lil i-ni-in-tar-ra ka ma-e ni-in-azag(?)-ga.  
. . . he hath separated . . . . me hath he purified.
12. Sag(?)-sag-gi(?)-da mu-un- . . . . .  
With wide-reaching heart he hath . . . . .
13. <sup>a</sup>. Mu-ul-lil u-mu-un-zu ni-ib-e (or -gim) ū- . . .  
Enlil, thy lord, . . . . .
14. Ud-da nina-mu me-en-ne šu-ba-zu šu-mu [he-tag-tag].  
Whilst my lady resteth, may my hand thy garment  
[touch].
15. A u-mu-un-[mu a laḥ-laḥ-ga šaba-mu ni-gala].  
The seed of [my] lord, [the pure seed, in my heart  
existeth].
16. A <sup>a</sup>. Zu-en-[na a laḥ-laḥ-ga šaba-mu ni-gala].  
The seed of Sin, [the pure seed, in my heart  
existeth].
17. A lugal-a-mu [ana-šu-ḥe-du a-mu kia-šu ḥe-du].  
May the seed of my king [go to heaven, may my  
seed go to the earth].



18. A-mu a lugala[-mu-dim kia-šu ge-im-ma-du].  
May my seed, [like] the seed of [my king, go to the earth].
19. <sup>a</sup> En-lil-li nam- . . . -e da [ga-na-nad].  
May Enlil by . . . . . lie down.
20. Giš im-ma-ni-in[-dug ne-en im-ma-ni-in-su-ub].  
He accomplished in her his love, in this wise he kissed her.
21. [Giš-aš dug-ga-ni giš-aš su-ub-ba-ni].  
[One his love-accomplishing, one his kissing].
22. A <sup>a</sup> [Zu]-en-[na . . . . . ša mu-na-ni-di].  
The seed of [Sin, the most holy seed (?), in my heart is set].
23. Ena-za [ki-uru im-ma-ni-in-gub-ba-ne (?).  
Thy lord [setteth foot in the palace—].
24. <sup>a</sup> En-lil ena-za [ki-uru dib-dibi-da-ni]  
Enlil, thy lord, [hath been installed in the palace].
25. . . . . nam-kalag . . . . .  
. . . . . might . . . . .
26. . . gir . . . . .  
. . foot (?) . . . . .
27. . . . . . . . . . .
28. šu (?) . . . . . na . . . . .
29. . . . . . En-lila-ra . . . . .  
. . . . . to Enlil . . . . .
30. En . . . . . ni (?) nig (?) nu- . . -šub.  
The lord . . . . . set not.
31. Šag . . . . . sag ni (?) . . . . . nu-ti-e-ne.  
Head (?) . . . his (?) head . . . . . they take not.
32. Zag-sal dug-ga ama <sup>a</sup> Nin-lil-li-šu.  
Singing praises to mother Ninlil
33. A-a <sup>a</sup> En-lil zag-sal.  
Father Enlil maketh melody.

---

In such an imperfect text as this there is naturally much room for error, and neither Professor Langdon nor

the present writer puts anything forward here as being final as a translation except, perhaps, the portion preserved on the bilingual tablet in the British Museum.

In order, however, to grasp satisfactorily the full meaning (as far as that can at present be ascertained) of this important mythological legend, it is needful to study to some extent the nature of the character of Enlil, and also, incidentally, of his spouse Ninlil, and the parallel passages based thereon.

As is well known, Merodach was the great god of Babylon, but his rise to favour among the people of that land is of comparatively late date—probably shortly before 2000 years B.C. Cast in a severer mould than Merodach, Enlil remained the principal deity of Nippur, the site from which these early Babylonian inscriptions came. In course of time, however, Enlil was placed in the background, and his son, En-urta (formerly read Ninip), took his place as god of Nippur.

The first name given to "father Enlil" in *Cuneiform Texts from Babylonian Tablets*, pt. xxiv, pl. 5, is Lugal-du-azaga, "the king of the Holy Abode," the name of a celebrated shrine in Babylon, and probably other places in Babylonia and the Babylonian heaven as well. This is followed by the common name of the deity—Enlil, with its assimilated form Illil, once given as the god of the fifty (? names), 𒂗𒌦 𒀭𒌦, and the god of the horn or finger, 𒂗𒌦 𒂗𒌦. As the former (or creator) he bore the name of 𒂗𒌦 𒂗𒌦 𒂗𒌦 𒂗𒌦, "the (divine) potter," which is best known as one of the descriptive titles of Éa or Hea with the same attribute. Other names of Enlil were Nun-nam-nir, "Lord of princeliness," or the like; Kur-gala, "the Great Mountain," a title which identifies him with Rimmon or Hadad; and Elum, the dialectic form of Alim, "the Honoured One." How highly Enlil was esteemed may be estimated from the fact that he was called 𒂗𒌦 𒂗𒌦 𒂗𒌦 𒂗𒌦, *dingir Kusgi*, "the god Gold," that is, the

god of the Golden Age, just as his predecessor, Anu, bore the title of  $\rightarrow\text{†}$   $\langle\text{W}\rangle$   $\text{†}$ , *dingir Azaga*, "the god Silver," and his successor, Êa, the name of *dingir Urudu*, "the god Bronze" or "Copper". If, as is probable, these deities were regarded as ruling over the ages connected with the metals named, the Babylonian theory differed from that of the Greeks and Romans, who thought that the golden age came first, the silver afterwards, and the bronze age last of all. In this connexion it is noteworthy that the Greeks and Romans connected the bronze (or copper) age with Neptune, and this, with the Babylonians, was the age of Êa, the god of the sea and of wisdom, who must therefore, in some degree, be identified with him.

Notwithstanding the bad moral reputation possessed by the Babylonians—a reputation shared by many another nation of the East—in the case of Enlil and Ninlil there is every probability that they attributed to these deities a far higher moral and godlike disposition than almost any of the deities of the Græco-Roman pantheon (except, perhaps, the goddess Diana) possessed. Such an ideal as this in the case of an honoured divinity, however, is only what would be expected, and in the sequel of these remarks this fact appears quite definitely.

One of the more noteworthy and difficult passages of the text is that in which the name of Zuenna—the Moon-god Sin—and of Nin-azu, appear. Now both these deities seem to have been the children of Enlil and Ninlil, and it is therefore natural that they should not have sexual intercourse with Ninlil, as such a translation as "semen" for  $\alpha$  in ll. 18 of obv., col. ii, and 5–8 of reverse, col. i, would otherwise demand. According to the legend of the seven evil spirits attacking the Moon-god Sin (W.A.I. iv, pl. 5, ll. 64–5), Sin, Šamaš, and Ištar (ll. 59–61) are described as the children of Enlil (ll. 52 and 54). With regard to Nin-azu, this is simply another name of En-urta (Ninip), the son of Enlil and Ninlil in

a very special sense, so that what would apply to him would also apply to Sin. The composition of this noteworthy legend would, therefore, seem to have been to set forth the way in which the begetting of the divine couple's sons, Sin and En-urta, came about.

The details or heads of the poem are practically as follows:—

I. The introduction, with the poetical description of Nippur, Enlil and Ninlil's earthly dwelling-place (pp. 186–7).

II. Standing on the banks of the Nun-Birdu, the god looks upon his spouse (p. 188).

III. Though looking upon her with pure eye, he seeks to approach her (pp. 189, 192–3).

IV. He comes to the palace, as does also Ninlil, and they call to the gate-keepers (pp. 193–4).

V. The gate not having been, apparently, opened at once, he repeats his summons. Entering (as we may suppose), he speaks pleasant things to Ninlil (pp. 194–5).

VI. Apparently at this point they obtain the promise of offspring (p. 195).

VII. Enlil therefore desires to touch her robe (p. 196).

VIII. It is permitted to Enlil to approach Ninlil “like the river of the land”, apparently meaning “coolly”, without amorous passion, or the like (p. 196).

IX. Enlil also has a desire to beget Nin-azu or En-urta (p. 196).

X. Enlil requests that his abode may not be revealed (p. 197).

XI. Ninlil's ferry-boat (p. 197).



XII. The scribe repeats Enlil's desire towards Ninlil, and the god remains installed in the palace (pp. 197–8).

XIII. The text becomes very defective, but the final lines indicate that Enlil praised Ninlil in song or with music (p. 198).

Many questions—topographical, religious, mythological, linguistic, literary, etc.—are connected with this important

Babylonian composition, so poetical in its nature, so deep in its inner meaning, so mysterious as to its origin. According to the Rabbins, Nippur was the Calneh of the 10th chapter of Genesis, and therefore a most important site, and one of the primitive cities of Babylonia—indeed, so ancient was its origin that the American explorers who have worked there have placed the date of its foundation as early as 10,000 years before Christ. Whether this be approximatively true or not, cannot at present be said, but it is probable that the estimate is not greatly, if at all, in excess of the truth. If not founded during the period when Enlil was in favour, it at least must have grown up to importance in those early ages of the history of civilization, and the legends of the divine couple's advent, espousals, and the birth and production of their offspring must have originated there.

And that leads to the question of the references to Zuenna (the Moon-god Sin), and Nin-azu (the War-god En-urta), also called Ninip, who are mentioned so often in the portion of the legend translated by Professor Langdon. To all appearance the inscription does not imply that they cast unchaste regards towards their mother Ninlil—that, even to the Babylonians, would have been altogether unthinkable. On the other hand, the thing which we should rather expect to find in the literature of the city, is the account of their begetting and birth, especially as one of them, En-urta, was destined to become the patron-god of Nippur after the retirement of Enlil, his father, as has already been pointed out.


The difficulty lies in the lines containing , *uš*, with the meaning of "phallus" (obv., ii, 10, 12, 14, 16, etc.), which seems to have been pronounced *giš* in such a case. Other lines containing this word are obv., col. ii, 17, rev., col. i, 37, but in these it is followed by , *aš*, "one." These passages seem to be illustrated by the

British Museum duplicate fragment, where, in the reverse, line 40, "sexual intercourse" seems to be represented by the Sumerian compound verb *giš-duga*, which is translated by the Semitic *rēḥû*, "to beget." But what is the meaning of *giš-aš dugga-ni*, *giš-aš subba-ni*? If *aš* here mean "one", perhaps we ought to translate, as in the rendering above, "one embrace his accomplishing, one embrace his kissing" (*suba*, "to kiss"). —, *aš*, however, not only means "one" but also "unique", in the sense of "perfect", "peerless"—"a perfect embrace his accomplishing, a perfect embrace his kissing." That a god, especially such a god as Enlil, should have nothing but "perfect" (possibly in the sense of "chaste") embraces and kisses, would be quite conceivable, notwithstanding the character attributed to the ancient Babylonians.

In the "monotheistic list of gods", where the principal deities of the Babylonians are all identified with Merodach, Enlil expresses that deity as "Merodach of lordship and dominion". This is apparently owing to his having borne the title of Bêl, "the lord," which became his distinctive appellation. In reality, however, as the child and successor of Anu, the heavens, he was the god of the air or the welkin, conceived by the Babylonians of the third millennium B.C. as being, like Anu, the father of the heavenly bodies—the sun, the moon, and Venus, to which, apparently, Mars, as god of war, was added later.

It would be interesting to know how the city Nippur became the great centre of the worship of Enlil and Ninlil. As is well known, the name of the city is written with the characters *En-lil*, followed by the determinative suffix indicating the name of a place, but without the determinative for "divinity" preceding. If these characters had not been pronounced *Nipri* in Sumerian and *Nippur* in Semitic, the explanation would,

perhaps, have been simplified. We look in vain, also, for the less-used name Calneh (Gen. x, 10), which, according to Rabbinical tradition, Nippur also bore.

For the rest, the obverse of the British Museum bilingual duplicate gives us some interesting information. The city was also called *Dur-ana*, one of the names of its great deity. Enlil, as the "bond of heaven", or, more fully, "heaven and earth" (*Dur-an-ki*, in cuneiform ). Another possible rendering is "the totality of heaven (and earth)", in Akkadian (Semitic) *kullat šamē u ērṣiti<sup>m</sup>*.

Naturally the arid summers and the bleak winters did not tend to improve the Babylonian landscape, and the flat plain is at such times far from beautiful. The vegetation of the best period of the year—the spring-time—appealed, therefore, to the Babylonians as being extremely fine, and for this reason, apparently, they gave to certain sites in the neighbourhood of their cities and elsewhere exceedingly poetical names. Thus, in the inscription now before us, the city seems to be called *Dur-gišimmar*, or "the date-palm grove", probably owing to its many date-plantations, and symbolical as well as poetical. After this comes the name of "its glorious stream", (*h*)*id-salla*, perhaps some extra-broad canal (*ndru rapšu*), its vineyard (*kar geštinna*), its food-store (*kar-ušar*), its well of sweet water (*tul lala*, literally, "the honey-well"). And then, there were the personages connected with Nippur—Enlil himself, the "young nobleman", Ninlil, the young handmaiden, *Nun-bar-še-gunnu*, otherwise *Nissāba*, the goddess of grain, the venerable matron. It often happens that there is something interesting in the names of the deities, and this may be the case here. *Nun-bar* I am unable to explain, but it is not improbably connected with *bar-nun*, which is rendered by the Semitic *ḥilṣu* and *šiliptu*, both of which are words connected with corn-cultivation. If the










Col. A.

Col. B.



Col. C.

Col. D.

A "MANICHÆAN" FRAGMENT FROM EGYPT.  
Brit. Mus. Or. 6201 C (1).

## IX

### A "MANICHÆAN" FRAGMENT FROM EGYPT

By W. E. CRUM

THE parchment fragment reproduced on Plate I was acquired some twenty years since by the British Museum, where it is numbered Or. 6201 C (1). It lay among a large quantity of Coptic papyrus and parchment MSS., the dialect, scripts, and incidental names of which confirm the seller's statement that all were bought together at Ashmunain. The ages of these manuscripts vary greatly; some of the parchment uncials should belong to the 5th or 6th century, others and some of the papyri to the 9th or 10th. The large majority of the latter are, however, of the 7th or 8th century. Obviously, from such facts none but the vaguest conclusions can be drawn.

The scraps of text here preserved are interesting for more reasons than one. Their script is that variety of Syriac known, since the discoveries of Messrs. A. von Le Coq and F. W. K. Müller, as "Manichæan",<sup>1</sup> a script which, were it not for the Oxyrhynchus fragments published by Professor Margoliouth,<sup>2</sup> one would not have expected to meet with in Egypt, all other examples of it having, so far, come from Turkestan. The language to write which this uncommon script is used is, like that of the Oxyrhynchus pieces, Syriac. Mr. E. W. Brooks has examined my transcript and recognized several words and terminations, for example<sup>3</sup>: col. A, 2 and 7, *hw'*; 6, *dywm' drdyh*; 8, *hwsmn' hwn*;

<sup>1</sup> See the former in the Berlin Academy's *Sitzb.* 1904, 348, and *Abh.* 1904; the latter in *ib. Abh.* 1910, and in this Journal, 1909, 299 (esp. 319). Further, Longworth Dames in this Journal, 1907, 1055.

<sup>2</sup> *Journ. Egypt. Arch.*, ii, 214.

<sup>3</sup> The half-consonants are here transcribed as written, without any vowel values being attributed to them.

9, *-lhw*n; 10, *hkn'*; col. B, 10, *-thwn*; col. D, 8, *hbyb'*, *wšwql'*.

But so far the subject of the text has not been identified; it remains to ascertain whether it be Christian or Manichæan. Syrians were to be found scattered through Upper Egypt<sup>1</sup>; witness, for instance, the Syriac *graffiti* found in the 6th century chapel in a Theban tomb.<sup>2</sup> If orthodox, they would in writing presumably use an ordinary type of *estrangelo*. Hence one might expect our text to be a fragment of Manichæan literature. The presence of Manichæans in Egypt is, however, not well attested. Shenoute (ob. 451) was indeed aware of them; on several occasions he turns aside to reprobate them<sup>3</sup>—but is this more than the preacher's rhetoric? The clergy of the preceding generation were said (by a much later chronicler<sup>4</sup>) to be deeply infected by the heresy. Even to the Nitrian hermits it was not unknown.<sup>5</sup> Where the name elsewhere occurs—and it does so very rarely—in Egyptian literature,<sup>6</sup> it would seem to be loosely used, as a term of abuse, probably without any longer implying distinctive heretical tenets.

<sup>1</sup> One may recall here the sojourn of Peter the Iberian at Oxyrhynchus and the translation thither of the relics of James *Intercisus*.

<sup>2</sup> *The Academy*, 1883, i, 264.

<sup>3</sup> Zoega, *Catalogus*, pp. 420, 450; Br. Mus. *Coptic Catalogue*, No. 194; Amélineau, *Œuvres de Sch.*, i, 372. Cf. Leipoldt, *Schenute v. Atripe*, 86.

<sup>4</sup> Eutychius; *Patr. Gr.*, 111, 1023.

<sup>5</sup> *Patr. Lat.*, 73, 945.

<sup>6</sup> Rival Monophysite sects are fond of using it of each other; *Patrol. Or.*, i, 454.

# X

## AN ETHIOPIC-FALASI GLOSSARY

EDITED AND TRANSLATED BY HARTWIG HIRSCHFELD

**A**MONG the MSS. which came into the possession of the library of Jews' College from the collection of the late Rev. Dr. A. Löwy there is one bearing the superscription "Geez and Falasha MS. brought [and] presented to A. Löwy from Dr. Athé, traveller in Abyssinia". To judge from the paper the MS. is of comparatively recent date, probably late eighteenth or early nineteenth century. It consists of thirty leaves,  $6\frac{1}{2}$  by  $4\frac{1}{2}$  inches, with between 22 and 32 lines on each page. On the first two pages is to be found a number of pencil notes in German, probably by either of the late owners.

The MS. is an Ethiopic-Amharic glossary of verbal stems, written in two parallel columns. It has two distinguishing features not shared by works of a similar character. The first is that the list of Ethiopic words is arranged in the alphabetical order of the final letters, just as is found in, and probably modelled on, the original Arabic dictionaries. The second feature is that in the Amharic column throughout, and in the Ethiopic occasionally, double consonants are marked by a dot above. Whence the author derived this peculiarity is not clear, unless we assume that he intended an imitation of the Hebrew *dāḡesh forte*. That this part of the work was not due to a mere whim is clear from the care which he bestowed on the placing of the dots, and there are very few instances in which a mistake seems to have been made.

There exist in the British Museum two small MSS. (Add. 16211<sup>1</sup> and 16239<sup>2</sup>) which contain Ethiopic-Amharic glossaries not restricted to verbal stems.

<sup>1</sup> Hereafter called A.

<sup>2</sup> B.

They are not, however, arranged in columns, nor are double letters marked by dots or anything else. Many of their items coincide with those in our MS., in others the Amharic equivalent is replaced by a synonym. A number of similar glossaries which are described in D'Abbadie, *Catalogue raisonné des MSS. éthiopiens* (1859), I have not been able to consult. How much there is still to be done in Ethiopic philology is illustrated by the fact that our vocabulary contains many words not recorded in Dillmann's *Lexicon*. In the following reproduction these are marked by an asterisk. There is also on the Amharic side a number of words not given in the dictionaries of D'Abbadie and Professor Guidi.

The end of our MS. is missing. About a dozen items I have supplemented from the two MSS. mentioned above.

ለሰሐ : አልጫ : ሆነ : to be insipid, tasteless.

ለብሐ : ሰረ. : to work.

መልሐ : መዘዘ : ነቀለ : አጸፈጠ : to pull out ; to transplant ; to sweeten.

መሰሐ : ቀሻ : በላ : to anoint.

መረሐ : መረ. : to guide.

መቶሐ : ሳሳ : <sup>1</sup> to be a glutton.

መድሐ : ዛቀ : to take greedily.<sup>2</sup>

ሰረሐ : ደከመ : to exert oneself.

ሰብሐ : ሰሳ : to be fat.<sup>3</sup>

ሰጥሐ : አሰጣ : to stretch.<sup>4</sup>

ሰፍሐ : ዘረጋ :: ሰፈ. : to spread ; to be large.

ረምጋ : ወጋ : to pierce.<sup>5</sup>

ረሰሐ : አደፈ : <sup>6</sup> to be dirty.

<sup>1</sup> Marg. viel essen.

<sup>3</sup> Marg. fett werden.

<sup>5</sup> Marg. kämpfen.

<sup>2</sup> Marg. mahlen (Mühle).

<sup>4</sup> Marg. ausbreiten.

<sup>6</sup> Marg. schmutzig sein.

ረቅሐ :	ጋረጠ :: ቀረቅረ : to prick a vein ; to insert a wedge.
ረብሐ :	ረሳ :: ጠቅመ :: በሳ : <sup>1</sup> to profit ; to be useful ; to increase.
ቀምሐ :	ቃመ :: <sup>2</sup> አፈረ. : <sup>3</sup> to devour ; to bear fruit.
ቀርሐ :	ጨለጠ : <sup>4</sup> to empty a vessel.
ቀድሐ :	ቀደ : <sup>5</sup> to draw water.
በልሀ : <sup>6</sup>	ተሳለ : <sup>7</sup> ፈጠነ :: ብልሀ : ሆነ : to be sharp ; to hasten ; to be intelligent.
በርሃ :	በረ. : <sup>8</sup> to shine.
በዝኃ :	በሳ : <sup>9</sup> to increase.
በጥሐ :	በሳ : <sup>10</sup> to cut a vein.
በጽሐ :	ደረሰ : arrive.
ኡብኩሐ :	አፍረ. : <sup>11</sup> to fan.
ተግሐ :	ተጋ : to watch.
ነቅሐ : <sup>12</sup>	ነቃ : to be awake.
ነብሐ :	ጮኸ : to call.
ነዝኃ : <sup>13</sup>	ረጨ : to sprinkle.
አንዝኃ :	ጎበኝ : <sup>14</sup> to explore.
ነድኃ :	ወጋ : <sup>15</sup> to fight.
ነግሃ :	ነጋ : <sup>16</sup> to dawn.
አንግሃ :	ጎሰጎሰ : <sup>17</sup> to walk quickly ; to hasten.

<sup>1</sup> Marg. *profitiren*.<sup>2</sup> Marg. *essen*.<sup>3</sup> Marg. *fruchttragend*.<sup>4</sup> Marg. *endigen, aufhören*.<sup>5</sup> Marg. *einschenken*.<sup>6</sup> Marg. *geschwind*.<sup>7</sup> Marg. *wetzen*.<sup>8</sup> Marg. *leuchten*.<sup>9</sup> Marg. *viel*.<sup>10</sup> Marg. *Ader lassen*.<sup>11</sup> Marg. *blasbalgen*.<sup>12</sup> Marg. *aufwachen*.<sup>13</sup> Marg. *sprengen*.<sup>14</sup> Marg. *beobachten*.<sup>15</sup> Marg. *mit dem Heere kämpfen*.<sup>16</sup> Marg. *morgen*.<sup>17</sup> Marg. *früh aufbrechen*.



ነጽሐ :	ለሆ :: <sup>1</sup> ጣለ :: <sup>2</sup> ነጣ :: <sup>3</sup> to distinguish ; to put ; to be pure.
ነፍሐ :	ነፋ :: ነፋሰ :: መታ :: አሳጀረ :: <sup>4</sup> to blow ; to fan ; to blow.
አይን :	ጠፋ : to perish ; to be extinguished.
ከልሐ :	ጮኸ : to call.
አውጽሐ :	አፈሰሰ : አቀረበ : to pour out ; to present.
ዙብሐ :	አረጀ :: ቀረጠ : (so) to slaughter ; to cut.
ዘግሐ :	ዘጋ :: ነሰረ :: ጣለ : to shut up ; to make wet ; to throw.
ደምን :	ዓወቀ : to know.
ደቅሐ :	ጠረቀ :: አነጠጠ :: <sup>5</sup> ሰራ : to affix ; to polish ; to work.
ደጉሀ :	ጉሰመ :: ወጋ : to strike ; to fight.
ገንሐ :	ተቀጣ : to be angry.
ጠብሐ :	አረጀ :: ገፈፈ : to slaughter ; to peel off.
ጠፋሐ :	አጨበጨበ :: መታ : to fold one's hands ; to beat.
ጸርሐ :	ጮኸ : to shout.
ጸብሐ :	ጠለቀ :: ጠሳ : to be deep ; to suck ; to be early.
ጸንሐ :	ቀጥ :: ሸመቀ :: ጠለቀ : to expect ; to lie in wait ; to be early.
ፈልሐ :	ፈለ : to boil.
ፈርሃ :	ፈራ : to fear.
ፈተሐ :	ፈረጀ :: ፈተ :: አሰናበተ : to judge ; to solve ; to deliver.

<sup>1</sup> Marg. trennen.  
reinigen.

<sup>2</sup> Marg. werfen.

<sup>4</sup> Marg. blasen (heil).

<sup>3</sup> Marg. weiss machen,

<sup>5</sup> Marg. arbeiten.

- ፈክሐ : ደስ : አለው : to rejoice.  
 ፈጽሐ : ፈነቅለ :: ሰነሰዋ : ወቅጠ : to reverse; to split; to pound.  
 ኩስሐ : በቁሙ : ኩስሐ : ነው : *cacavit animal*.  
 \*ጉረሐ : ጥጥነኩለ : to cheat.  
 \*ለሐሐ : ሰራ : to work.  
 ደግፓ : ከፋ : አለ :: ጠፍ : to be high; to be strong.  
 ሲሐ : ወቅጠ : to pound.  
 ቂሐ : ቀላ : to be red.  
 ጒሐ : ቀላወጠ : to obtrude to dinner.  
 ጸሐ : ጸረገ : to sweep.  
 ሎሐ : ጻፈ : to write.  
 ሮፓ : ነሰነሰ : to scatter.  
 አቦሐ : አሰለጠነ : to give authority.  
 ፍፓ : ረዘመ : to be long.  
 ጎሐ : በራ : to be shining.  
 ለቅሐ : አበጀረ : to lend.  
 \*ለጥሐ : ገሰረ : to pay tribute.  
 ጥመክሐ : ጥመካ : to boast.  
 ሰርሐ : አቀፍ : to direct; to straighten.  
 ሰብሐ : አመሰግነ :: አከሰረ :: ገለጠ :: በራ : to praise; to honour; to reveal; to shine.  
 አይሐ : ሸገነ : to skip.  
 በርሐ : በራ : ሆነ :: አገደረረ : to be bright.  
 ጥበውሐ : ሰለጠነ : to have power.

ነሰሐ :	ተመለሰ :: አዘነ : to come back ; to regret.
አምጋ :	አጀ : ነሳ : to salute.
ከሰሐ :	ጋረጠ : to gaze.
ወክሐ :	ደነፋ : to make a display.
ወጥሐ :	ከመረ : to accumulate.
ተወጥሐ :	ተቀመጠ : to sit.
ዘሰሐ :	ዘለለ : to jump.
ተዋውህ :	ተሞኘ :: ቅን : ሆነ : to desire ; to be honest.
ጸብሐ :	ገበረ : to pay tribute.
ተፈሠሐ :	ደስ : አለው : to be glad.
ለሐሐ :	ላለ : to yield ; to be gentle.
አመልተሐ :	አርገበገበ : to move to and fro.
መርቅሐ :	ሰነጠቀ : to split.
አመርገሐ :	አንከባለለ : to revolve.
መንዘጋ :	ተሞግጠለ : ተደላጀለ : to be delicate ; to be fixed.
ሰሐሰሐ :	ሲሰነ : to be profligate.
ቀሐቅሐ :	ደምፀ : አሰማ : መታ :: to make a noise ; to beat.
ነጥንጋ :	ተንጀረሰበ : to be full.
*ከልተሐ :	አሰረ : to bind.
ዘሐዘሐ :	ተርፍርፍ : አለ : to be abundant.
ገህግህ :	ከለከለ : to prohibit.
ተጸንሐሐ :	ተኻተተ : to smell.
አስከሐክሐ :	አስካካ :: አከከ : to neigh ; to feel a tickle.

አቅዋሐይሐ :	አቀላላ : to alleviate.
አንሰሐሰሐ :	አንቀሳሳ : to shake.
አንቀሐቅሐ :	አንቋቋ : to give a hearing.
አንበሐብሐ :	አገላግሰጠ :: ፈሰሰ : to turn upside down; to flow.
አንሰሐክሐ :	ፈጥፈጥ : to serve small pieces of meat ( <i>fitfit</i> ) on bread.
አጽነሐንሐ :	ተወዛወዘ : to be shaken.
ሞቅሐ :	አሰረ : to bind.
ተሞኖሐ :	ተጉጥጥ : to dress oneself.
ቶሰሐ :	ቀላቅለ : to mix.
ሳርሐ :	በረ : to shine.
ተቋቋሐ :	ደንበረ : to be afraid.
ባልሐ :	አደነ : to heal; to restore.
ተባጽሐ :	ተጣላ : to be thrown.
ጋውሃ :	ጋላለጠ : to uncover.
ተጽብሐ :	ተነጋገረ : to hold a conversation.
አስተፍጽሐ :	ለየ : to distinguish.
ተወጋውጋ :	ተመላለሰ :: በረ : to walk about; to shine.
ሳሕሰሐ :	ፈገፈገ : to brush; to scrape.
ራሃርጌ :	አዘነ : to be sorry.
ቋቅሐ :	ተዘ : አለ : to remember.
ሳህብህ :	አፈሰሰ : to pour out.
ተፍሕንሐ :	ዘገየ : to delay.
ጋሕግሃ :	ከፈጥ : to open.

- ጸሕጽሐ : ጉረፈ :: ቀዘነ : to flow; to have the diarrhoea.
- ጥልዕል : ከፍ : አለ : to be high.
- ጥስኦል : ጠየቀ : to inquire.
- ብህል : አለ : to speak.
- ብዕል : ከበረ : to be rich, honoured.
- ጥሕል : ቀላዕጠ : to dine uninvited (at another's expense).
- ጥህል : ፈረሰ : to break; to be destroyed.
- ከህል : ቻለ : to be able.
- ውዕል : ደረቀ : to be dry.
- ዝኅል : ዛገ :: ቀዘቀዘ : to corrode; to be cold.
- ጥድኅል : ከበለለ : to escape.
- ጥሕል : አተለ : to deposit dregs.
- ፍሕል : ጥኮረ : to be proud, obstinate.
- ከሕል : ካለ : to paint the eyelashes with antimony.
- ሐጉል : አጣ : to want.
- ጥፋጉል : ጠፋ : to perish.
- ቀብል : ጉደለ : to decrease.
- ጸውል : ደረቀ : to be dry.
- ቀብል : ቁሰለ : to be sore.
- ሐመል : ለቀመ : to pick up.
- ሐሰል : ለሰበ : to harness.
- ሀበል : አሰለ : to tell a lie.
- ሐዘል : አዘለ : to carry on one's back.
- ጥለዒል : ከፍ : አለ : to be high.

օտձ : օտձ : to take an oath.  
 օտձ : օտձ : to resemble.  
 \*օտձ : օտձ : to divide.  
 օտձ : օտձ : to be sharp.  
 օտձ : օտձ : to hang.  
 օտձ : ԽՀԽՀ : to disperse.  
 օտձ : օտձ : օտձ : to beg ; to sharpen,  
                     to work.  
 օտձ : ԽՀԽՀ : to bear fruit.  
 \*օտձ : օտձ : to weigh.  
 օտձ : օտձ : to predict.  
 \*օտձ : օտձ : to insert a wedge.  
 օտձ : օտձ : to charge, to saddle.  
 \*օտձ : օտձ : to tear.  
 օտձ : օտձ : to kill.  
 օտձ : օտձ : to deck ; to gild ; to varnish.  
 օտձ : օտձ : to mature ; to boil.  
 \*օտձ : օտձ : to offend.  
 օտձ : օտձ : օտձ : to perish ; to be bad.  
 օտձ : օտձ : to peel off.  
 օտձ : օտձ : to grow.  
 օտձ : օտձ : օտձ : to place ; to plant.  
 օտձ : օտձ : to cause to hurry.  
 օտձ : օտձ : to pull up ; transplant.  
 օտձ : օտձ : to make a hole.  
 \*օտձ : օտձ : to unfold ; to untie.

አመለ :	አደረገ :	to do ; to make.
አቀለ :	አከማቸ :	to gather.
አከለ :	በቃ :	to suffice.
አኝከለ :	በላ :	to eat.
ከፈለ :	አደለ :	to apportion.
ወዓለ :	ዋለ :	to pass the day.
ዘበለ :	አገለለ :	to want to be alone.
ደወለ :	ወሰነ :	to limit ; to confine.
ገደለ :	ገደለ :	to kill.
ጠቀለ :	ወነጀለ :	to be false.
ጸዓለ :	ሰጀበ :	to rebuke ; to insult.
ጸደለ :	በረ. :	to shine.
ፈተለ :	ፈተለ :	to spin.
ፈደለ :	በዛ :	to increase.
አቁጸለ :	ቅጸለ : አወጣ :	to produce leaves.
ሐቀለ :	ቀማ : ቦላጅ : ሆነ :	to rob ; to be a rebel.
ተሐሰለ :	ደፈረ :	to be bold, impudent.
ጓዶለ :	በረታ :	to be strong.
መሰለ :	መሰለ :	to resemble.
መሰለ :	ሰለጠነ :	to have power.
ሰሰለ :	ወገደ :	to go away.
ተበቀለ :	ተበቀለ :	to be avenged.
ተቀሰለ :	ተቀበለ :	to receive.
ተቀጸለ :	ተቀጸለ :	the roof is constructed with eaves.
አሰለ :	አሸ : አለ : ቀረጠ :	(so) to consent ; to decide.
ተዓገለ :	ቀማ :	to rob.

- ከሰለ : ንጋደ : ቀረጠ :: (so) to cover ; to decide.
- ከወለ : ሰወረ : to hide.
- ተወከለ : ታመነ : to trust.
- ደሰለ : ከመከመ : to make level.
- ጸሰለ : ንጋደ :: አደነቅረ : (so) to veil ; to deafen.
- ሐንበለ : ሰፈ : to be wide.
- አመስቀለ : አመሳቀለ : to hang.
- አመደበለ : አከማኾ : to gather.
- ሰንሰለ : አሰረ : አደያዘ :: to bind ; to take prisoner.
- በልበለ : ዓረጀ : to be old, worn.
- ተንበለ : ለመነ :: አማላደ :: አሰለመ : to beg ; to intercede ; to be a Moslim.
- ተአንተለ : ቸል : አለ : to neglect.
- ተደንገለ : ተጠሰቀ : to attach, to guard.
- ገንጸለ : ገለሰጠ : to turn upside down.
- ጡበለለ : ጠቀሰለ : to wrap in any thing.
- ጠንቀለ : ጠነቅለ : to foretell.
- አጸንገለ : መላሰሰ :: አነበበ : to return ; to repeat ; to read.
- ጸንጸለ : መታ :: ካካአሰ : to beat ; to make a noise.
- ፈልፈለ : ፈለቀ : to gush, bubble up.
- ቀልቀለ : ወረወረ : to throw.
- ተቀልቀለ : ወረደ : to descend.
- ቀንጸለ : በተነ : to scatter.
- ሐለለ : አረረ :: አለለ : to sprinkle.
- አለለ : ለዩ :: ገለተ :: ቀለም : አገሳ : to distinguish ; to assign a legacy ; to colour.



አጽላላ :	ተጠጋ :: አረፈ : to support oneself ; to rest.
ጸላላ :	ሰፈፈ : to float ; to spread oneself.
ቀላ :	ቀለለ : to be light.
ጠላ :	ለመለመ : to be green, fresh.
ኢላ :	ዞረ : to go round.
*ዞላ :	አደወረ :: አቀለመ : to prepare the thread for the shuttle ; <i>id.</i>
አሕመልመላ :	ለመለመ : to be green, fresh.
አንቀልቀላ :	ተኖወወ : to be shaken.
አንበልበላ :	በራ :: ነጀደ : to shine ; to burn.
አጽደልደላ :	በራ :: አበራ : to shine ; to give light.
አንኩላላ :	አዞረ : to turn round.
ተሐወላ :	ተቀላቀለ : to be mixed.
ተሠሃላ :	ደቅረ : አለ : to forgive.
ተኖወላ :	ቁረበ : to receive the communion.
ተከሃላ :	ተሰማማ : to agree.
ተካወላ :	ወደኋላ : ሆነ : to be behind.
ተፈወላ :	ጠነቅቀ : to foretell.
ቢላላ :	ፈታ : to open ; to deliver.
ተሰነላላ :	ተሰነሰተ : to take leave.
ተወላወላ :	ተጠራጠረ : to doubt.
አማዕቀላ :	አከማቸ : to collect.
አማዕበላ :	ተቆጣ : to be angry.
አማዕከላ :	አማከለ : to be in the middle.
*ካህላላ :	ደረቀ : to be dry.

ደሐላላ : ዘገዮ : to tarry.

አንሳሐላላ : ጥመላላሳ : to walk about.

አንዛኛላላ : ሰነፈ : to be foolish.

ልሕመ : ላመ :: ጸኖ : to be fine ; to be strong.

ብሕመ : ደደ : ሆነ : to be dumb.

ዛሕመ : ሞዋ : to be warm.

ጥዕመ : ጸፈጠ : to be sweet.

ጥፋዕመ : ጐረሰ : to be greedy.

ጥሐከመ : ዛም : አለ : to be silent.

ጥሰክመ : ጥሽከመ : to carry a burden.

ጥሰጥመ : ጠለቀ : to be deep ; to dip.

ዘንመ : ዘነበ : to rain.

ደክመ : ደከመ : to be fatigued.

ጸልመ : ጠቅረ : to be black.

ጥፈጽመ : ሰነደ : to worship.

ሐላመ : አለመ : to dream.

ሐሰመ : ከፈ : to be bad.

\*ጌረመ : ጥወ : to leave.

ጌተመ : ቀለፈ :: ከፈለ :: አሳለፈ : to shut up ;  
to divide ; to prepare for battle.

ሐደመ : ሽሽ :: አንቀላፈ : to flee ; to be sleepy.

ለተመ : ሰሰቀ : ነደፈ : to knead ; to beat ; to sting.

ለጉመ : ለጉመ : to saddle a horse.

ሰረመ : አጠለቀ : to deepen.

ሰቀመ : ማረከ : to capture.

ሰዒመ : ሳመ : to kiss.

- ረቀመ : ሳለ :: ጸፈ : to be sharp ; to write.  
 ረዓመ : ጮኸ : to call.  
 ረገመ : ሰፂበ :: ረገመ : to rebuke ; to curse.  
 ቀለመ : ጸፈ : to write.  
 ቀሰመ : ለቀመ :: አጸፈጠ : to collect ; to sweeten.  
 ቀረመ : ማረረ : to glean.  
 ቀደመ : አበዛ :: በለጠ :: ቀደመ : to multiply ; to precede.  
 ተለመ : ተለመ : to plough.  
 አነመ : ሰራ :: ፈተለ :: ተተነከለ : to work ; to spin ; to be crafty.  
 ከረመ : ከረመ : to pass the winter.  
 ደገመ : ደገመ : to repeat.  
 ገረመ : ተፈረ : to be feared.  
 ገዘመ : ቆረጠ : to cut.  
 ጠዓመ : ቀመሰ : to taste.  
 ጸተመ : ለቀመ : to collect.  
 ፈጸመ : ዘጋ :: ቀባ : to close ; to anoint.  
 ሐመመ : ተመቀኝ : to envy.  
 አርመመ : ዝም :: አለ : to be silent.  
 ተጸመመ : ቸል :: አለ : to despise.  
 ሐመ : ታመመ : to be ill.  
 ተደመ : ተደነቀ : ፈዘዘ : to wonder ; to be powerless.  
 ጠመ : ጣለ : to throw.  
 ጸመ : ደረቀ : to be dry.  
 ሢመ : ሾመ : to put ; to appoint.  
 \*አመ : አኖረ : to put ; to establish.

ቆመ :	ቆመ : to stand.
ኖመ :	ተኝ : to sleep.
ጦመ :	ጠቀሰ : to envelop.
ጸመ :	ጸመ : to fast.
ተቀፆመ :	ተቀፆመ : to hate.
አለመ :	ጻፈ :: ፈጠረ :: አስተማረ : to write; to create; to work; to teach.
ዒቆመ :	ወሰነ : to limit.
አጀመ :	አማረ :: አቃጠረ :: ጀነ : አለ : to forgive; to reward; to be pleased.
ጸጎመ :	ጠመመ : to be twisted, distorted.
ፈጸመ :	ጨረነ : to finish.
ሐርተመ :	ጐብቆለ : to be miserable.
ለግመመ :	ለመለመ : to be green, fresh.
ተርጎመ :	ተረጎመ : to translate; to be translated.
ደክተመ :	ደህ : ሆነ : to be poor.
ጐርዓመ :	አጎመ : to apply a cupping glass.
ተሰለመ :	ተሰማማ : to agree.
ተቃረመ :	ተቃረመ : to glean.
ተቃወመ :	ተቃወመ : to resist.
አስተሐመመ :	አሰበ :: ነቃ :: ተገ : to think; to be awake; to watch.
አስተቃስመ :	አማረተ : to foretell.
*ደሐመመ :	አፈረነ : to demolish.
*ጢጠመ :	ጠረጠረ : to doubt.
አጸመ :	አጥንት : ሆነ : to be lean, bony.

ርሕሰ :	ራሰ : to be damp.
ርኝሰ :	ኣለቃ : ሆነ : to be chief.
ብዕሰ :	ተጣላ : to be thrown away.
ንዕሰ :	ኣነሰ : to be small.
ተውንሰ :	ተዋሰ : to be surety.
ተግንሰ :	ኣገለለ : (so) to want to be alone.
ፍሕሰ :	ዋላ :: ፈተላ : to be red ; to spin.
ኩሕሰ :	ሰፈ : to be wide.
ለብሰ :	ለሰሰ : to dress.
ረኩሰ :	ኣጀፈ : to be dirty.
ነግሠ :	ነገሰ : to govern.
ተከንሰ :	ሰገደ : to worship.
ዮብሰ :	ደረቀ : to be dry.
ፀርሰ :	ተወለዐዐዐ : hebesare dedentibus.
ፀብሰ :	ደረቀ : to be dry.
ፀንሰ :	ጸነሰ : to conceive.
ጸውሰ :	ልምሾ : ሆነ : to be weak.
ሐረሰ :	ኣረሰ : to plough.
ሐዩሰ :	ተሻለ : to be better.
ሐፈሰ :	ኣፈሰ : to seize (with both hands).
ለቀሰ :	ለሰ : to lick.
ነሐሰ :	ኖሰ : to make a wall.
ወረሰ :	ወረሰ : to inherit.
ወዋሰ :	ከሰሰ : to accuse.
ደረሰ :	ተናገረ : to speak ; to explain.
*ገንሰ :	ገነ : to enter.

ጠቦሰ :	ጠቦሰ : to roast ; to fry.
አጽሐሰ :	አሸቦሽቦ : to beat the ground with the feet.
ፈላሰ :	ተሰጅደ : to be exiled, a foreigner.
ፈረሰ :	ፈረሰ : to break ; to be destroyed.
*ፈደሰ :	ጋረጠ : to prick a vein.
ኃሠሠ :	ፈለገ :: መረመረ : to inquire ; to search.
ገሠሠ :	ደሰሰ : to touch.
*ጠሰሰ :	ደከመ : to labour ; to be fatigued.
ቀሰ :	ቀሰሰ : to be ordained a priest.
ሂሰ :	ነቅፈ : to reprove.
ሚሰ :	ጠጅ : አደረገ : to make mead.
ኢሰ :	ተፃፃረ : to be in distress ; to suffer grief.
ኒሠ :	ሂደ : to depart.
ጢሰ :	ጢሰ : to smoke.
ሆሰ :	ጨመረ :: ነቀነቀ : to add ; to shake.
ሎሰ :	ለወሰ : to knead.
አኮሰ :	አፍወጠ : to stir.
ኃመሰ :	ዋኝ :: አምስት : አደረገ : to swim ; to make five.
ሐረሰ :	ተኛ :: ንራሰ : ሆነ : to sleep ; to be confined.
ሐጀሰ :	አጀሰ :: አጸፍ : to renew ; to confirm.
መለሰ :	መለሰ : to repeat ; to return (tr.).
ሠለሰ :	ሶስተ : አደረገ : to make three.
ሰጀሰ :	ስድሳት : አደረገ : to make six.
ሰቅሰ :	ጉደለ : to decrease ; to be deficient.

ቀጅሰ :	አመሰገነ :: አከሰረ :: አነጸ :: ለዋ :
	to praise; to honour; to cleanse; to distinguish.
*በቆሰ :	ነቆሰ : to comb.
አሰሰ :	በጀለ : to offend.
ተግገወ :	ተገወ : to be patient.
ከነሰ :	አንድ : አደረገ : to unite.
ወጀሰ :	አመሰገነ : to praise.
ደቆሰ :	አንቀለፈ : to sleep.
ተደነሰ :	አጀፈ : to be dirty.
ተጸጸሰ :	ጸጸሰ : ሆነ : was made a bishop.
ተጸነሰ :	ተፑገረ : to be poor.
ፈወሰ :	ፈወሰ : to cure.
ሐንከሰ :	አነከሰ : to limp.
አመርሰሰ :	ደሰሰ : to be tarnished.
መንኰሰ :	ተለዋ : to be separated; to be a recluse.
ነሰነሰ :	አሳረፈ : to change (money).
አንፈሰ :	ደሰ : አሰኘ : to give joy.
ተአንሰሰ :	ተገዛ : to be subject.
ዘለገሰ :	ቁሰለ : to feel pain (from a wound).
ደምሰሰ :	አጠፈ : to ruin, destroy.
ገብሰሰ :	ለቀለቀ : to bedaub; to overlay.
አስተንፈሰ :	ተነፈሰ :: ተናገረ : to breathe; to speak.
አንበሰሰ :	ገለጠ : to uncover; to reveal.
አንገሰገሰ :	አፈጠ : to quake.
አነፈሰፈሰ :	ነፈሰ : to blow, breathe.

- ተሞገሰ : ገለጫል : ሆነ : to be somebody's favourite.  
 አልፎሰሰ : ሹክ : አለ : to whisper.  
 አክሞሰሰ : ገለጠ : to uncover; to expose.  
 ተቃለሰ : ታገለ : to wrestle.  
 ተፈሰሰ : ተሻየተ : to trade.  
 ገረሰ : ሰራ : to work.  
 ምሕረ : ራራ :: አዘነ : to be kind; to regret; to spare.  
 ሰኦረ : ለመለመ : ተፈታ : to thrive; to be permitted.  
 ብሕረ : ሰፈ : to be ample.  
 ንሕረ : አኩረፈ : to snore.  
 ተዘኝረ : ታሰየ :: ዋሽ : to boast; to speak falsehood.  
 ተደኝረ : ወደኋላ : ሆነ : to retract a given promise.  
 ገዕረ : ተጨነቀ : to be distressed.  
 ጥሕረ : ጮኸ : to roar, to shout.  
 ተጽዕረ : ተጨነቀ : to be distressed, anxious.  
 ፈህረ : አጨ :: ቀፈረ : to betroth; to dig.  
 ንሰረ : ጉሰቀለ : to be miserable.  
 ሐብረ : አንድ : ሆነ : to be united.  
 ሐፀረ : አጠረ : to make a fence.  
 ንፈረ : አፈረ : to be modest, bashful.  
 ተሰግረ : ተጸመደ : to be caught.  
 ሠምረ : ወደደ : to love; to wish.  
 ሰክረ : ሰከረ : to be drunk.  
 ተሰኩረ : ሰኩር : ሆነ : to be first-born.  
 ተአኩረ : ቃሰተ : to gasp.



ከብረ :	ከሰረ : to be honoured.
ገብረ :	አደረገ :: ሰራ : ፈጠረ : to make ; to work ; to create.
ኅበረ :	አሰረ : to associate.
ጓደረ :	አደረ : to stay ; to pass the night.
ሐጠረ :	ደኅደኅ : to be thick.
ሐጸረ :	አሰረ : [አጥረን : ነው :] to make a fence.
ሐፈረ :	አፈረ : to be modest.
መሐረ :	አስተማረ :: መጸውተ : to teach ; to give alms.
መተረ :	ቁረጠ : to decide.
መከረ :	መከረ : to advise.
መዘረ :	ጠላ : አደረገ : to make beer.
ሰበረ :	ሰበረ : to break.
ሰተረ :	ሰነጠቀ :: ዘረጋ : to split ; to extend.
ሰዓረ :	ኻረ : to abolish.
ሰዘረ :	ሰነዘረ : to span.
ሰገረ :	ተራመደ : to stride.
ሰፀረ :	ሰነጠቀ : to split.
ሰፈረ :	ሰፈረ : to measure.
ሰቀረ :	በሳ : to perforate.
ቀበረ :	ቀበረ : to bury.
ቀጸረ :	ቀሰረ : to surround with a fence.
አቅጸረ :	ከሰበ : to surround.
አብሰረ :	የምስራቅ : አለ : to give good tidings.
አብደረ :	መረጠ : to choose.

በደረ :	ቀደሶ : to precede.
ነበረ :	ተቀመጠ : to sit.
አንከረ :	አደኝቀ : to wonder ; to admire.
ነከረ :	ለየ : to distinguish.
አንወረ :	ነቀፈ :: አነወረ : to reprove.
ነዘረ :	የጨቀ : to snatch away.
ነገረ :	ነገረ : to say.
ነጸረ :	ለየ : to distinguish.
ነፈረ :	በረረ : to fly.
ነቀረ :	ጠፈ : to perish.
አኤመረ :	አወቀ :: አሳወቀ : to know ; to inform.
አሰረ :	አንድ : አደረገ : to unite.
ዓበረ :	ደረቀ : to be dry.
አቀረ :	ቋጠረ : to tie.
ከተረ :	ቀማ :: አጠፋ : to seize ; to destroy.
ወቀረ :	ወቀረ : to cut ; to engrave.
ወተረ :	ለጠጠ : to bend (a bow) ; to polish.
አውተረ :	አዘወተረ : to continue.
ወገረ :	ጣለ :: አጠነ :: መታ : to throw ; to burn incense ; to beat.
ወፈረ :	ተሰመረ : to pasture.
ዘከረ :	ጠራ : to call ; to exclaim.
ደጓረ :	ፈታ :: መረቀ : to open ; to bless.
ደፈረ :	ደፈረ : to dare.
አግመረ :	ቻለ :: አስቻለ : to be able ; to enable.
ገዓረ :	ጮከ : to call.

ገዘረ :	ገረዘ : to circumcise.
ፀበረ :	ፍቃ : ሆኑ : to be dirty.
ፈገረ :	አጪ : to give in marriage.
አፋቀረ :	ወደደ : to love.
ፈጠረ :	ፈጠረ : to create.
ቁጸረ :	አሰረ : to bind ; to join.
ሰረረ :	ወጣ : to go forth.
በረረ :	በረረ : to fly.
ገረረ :	ተገዛ : to be subject.
አጸረረ :	አመጠ : to be a rebel.
መረ :	መረረ : to be bitter.
ተደረ :	በላ : to eat.
ቁረ :	በረደ : to be cold.
ሖረ :	ሂደ : to depart.
ዖረ :	ጠፋ : to be extinct.
ጸረ :	ተሸከመ : to carry a burden.
ተመከረ :	ተፈተነ : to be tried.
መጸረ :	አላመጠ : to smile ; to smack the lips.
ሰወረ :	ሰወረ : to hide.
ቀመረ :	ከፈለ :: ሰፈረ : to divide ; to measure.
*ቀጸረ :	ቁረጠመ : to chew noisily ; to have rheumatism.

(To be continued.)

# MISCELLANEOUS COMMUNICATIONS

## SOURCES OF THE PALI COMMENTARIES

There is a note by Mr. E. W. Burlingame in the last issue (vol. xxxviii, pt. iv) of the *Journal of the American Oriental Society*. The note raises some interesting questions and incidentally gives a list of Jātaka stories found also in the Canon. His list contains ten Jātakas. I published fifteen years ago a similar list in *Buddhist India* (1903, p. 195), also giving ten, two not in Mr. Burlingame's list, which contains two not in mine, I have also since found three others. The full list as at present known would therefore be as follows:—

### JĀTAKA TALES IN THE CANON

1.	Jātaka No.	1	is based on	Digha. 2. 342.
2.	„	9	„	Majjh. 2. 75.
3.	„	10	„	Vin. 2. 188.
4.	„	28	„	Vin. 4. 5.
5.	„	37	„	Vin. 2. 161.
6.	„	31	„	Digha. 2. 348.
7.	„	95	„	Digha. 2. 169.
8.	„	168	„	Samy. 5. 146.
9.	„	203	„	Vin. 2. 109.
10.	„	233	„	Vin. 3. 145.
11.	„	392	„	Samy. 1. 204.
12.	„	405	„	{ Majjh. 1. 328. Samy. 1. 142.
13.	„	541	„	Majjh. 2. 75.

The tales are not identical, though occasionally the same expressions are used. The canonical texts are usually shorter and always written in a more archaic style and language. The Jātaka texts retell the tales in their own way. Only in one or two cases do they run the original fairly close.

Now the number of actual Jātakas in the Jātaka book is 553, and there are others extant in the Canon, or illustrated at least as early as the second century B.C., not included in the Jātaka collection. The list above gives only about two per cent of this number. The origin of the other 97 or 98 per cent is left uncertain.

Here Mr. Burlingame comes to our rescue. He is of opinion that the Jātaka book copied from the other commentaries, especially those of Buddhaghosa, which he dates as earlier, and he adds that they in turn drew independently from still earlier Pali originals.

The difficulty is that we know of no such books. Buddhaghosa, Dhammapāla, and the authors of the Jātaka and Dhammapada commentaries give the authorities on which they based their works. They mention no such Pali originals. Already in 1900 Mrs. Rhys Davids, in the introduction to her *Buddhist Psychology*<sup>1</sup> (published by the R.A.S.), collected the then known evidence as to the history of the commentaries. There is no mention of such Pali originals. Neither does Winternitz refer to any such books in his *Indische Literaturgeschichte*.<sup>2</sup> It is at least very strange that, if they had really existed, such Pali originals of the commentaries should have been utterly forgotten in the East, and have left no evidence of their existence that can be traced by those European scholars who have considered the question.

Still, a new hypothesis is often most useful in exciting fresh inquiry, and we trust that Mr. Burlingame will work out the details of his reconstruction in the introduction to the new work he promises us on *Buddhist Parables*. There he will have greater space than his short note allows.

T. W. RHYS DAVIDS.

<sup>1</sup> pp. xx-xxvi.

<sup>2</sup> Vol. ii, p. 147.

THE PLAYS ASCRIBED TO BHĀSA AND THE  
MATTA-VILĀSA

The group of plays published by Pandit Ganapati Sastri in Nos. 15-17, 20-2, 26, 39, and 42 of the Trivandrum Sanskrit Series is now doubtless familiar to most Sanskritists; but few, I suspect, will agree with the learned editor's ascription of them to Bhāsa, for which he adduces no evidence of the least cogency. I venture, however, to call attention to another work which throws some light on the subject, and for the publication of which we again have to thank the Pandit. This is the *Matta-vilāsa*, issued as No. 55 of the Trivandrum Sanskrit Series. The *Matta-vilāsa* is an amusing little farce, which in its prelude tells us that its author was the Pallava king Mahēndra-vikrama-varman. As the Pandit points out in his introduction, this king may be identified almost certainly with Mahēndra-vikrama-varman I, who bears on inscriptions the titles *Avanibhājana*, *Guṇa-bhara*, *Matta-vilāsa*, and *Śatru-malla*, and is known from the same source to have composed a farce called *Matta-vilāsa* (*E.I.* iv, p. 152; *S.I.I.* i, p. 29 f.; *Dir. Gen. Ann. Report of Arch. Survey*, 1903-4, p. 270 f.; G. Jouveau-Dubreuil, *The Pallavas*, pp. 38 ff.); and assurance is made doubly sure by the fact that the present play refers to the first three of his titles on p. 1 and to the last in its concluding verse. Now this *Matta-vilāsa* shows the same technical features as the thirteen plays which the Pandit ascribes to Bhāsa; and we may therefore with some confidence attribute the latter, not to Bhāsa, but to an anonymous poet living in the same part of India and in about the same period as Mahēndra-vikrama-varman. Furthermore, six out of these thirteen plays end with a verse invoking a blessing on a king *Rājasimha*; and it seems therefore reasonable to conjecture that by the latter is meant the Pāṇḍya Tēr-Māraṇ Rājasimha I, who flourished about

675 A.D. Hence I infer that the plays of "Bhāsa" were composed in the second half of the seventh century, and have no connexion whatever with Bhāsa.

L. D. BARNETT.

#### THE DATE OF THE BOOK OF JOB

This has always been a crux. In the able article on the Book of Job in the *Encyclopædia Britannica* it is stated, p. 426, that the book has no direct reference to historical events, and that its age can be fixed only approximately.

I do not know if it has been suggested before that some light on the date may be found in chap. xix, v. 24 of the book, and it seems to me that we have a reference there to the great inscription at Bī-sitūn<sup>1</sup> of Darius Hystaspes. The verse (R.V.) says: "(Oh) that with an iron pen and lead they (Job's words) were graven in the rock for ever!" Sir Henry Rawlinson tells us that "when the unsoundness of the surface-stone of the rock made it difficult to give the necessary polish, another piece of stone was inserted, and fixed by being embedded in molten lead".

I am not aware whether it has been found that lead was used in other ancient rock-inscriptions. If not, is there not a probability that the verse has a reference to the great and world-famous inscription of Darius? That inscription was made in the sixth century B.C., and if my suggestion be correct, Job cannot have been written earlier than that date.

H. BEVERIDGE.

December 30, 1918.

<sup>1</sup> It has been said that Bī-sitūn is a corruption of the "Bāghistān" of Diodorus Siculus, but is it not more likely to be a synonym thereof? For Bāghistān can mean Heaven, and this is the meaning of Bī-sitūn also, without pillars, the firmament, Heaven. Orientals regard it as one of the marvels of creation that the sky does not fall, though destitute of pillars, and we find the same idea in a letter of Martin Luther's where he says (Köstlin's *Life*, ii, 234) that he has lately seen two marvels, one of them being that Heaven has no pillars, yet does not fall down.

## AN ARABIC WORD QUOTED BY HEMACANDRA

The grammarian Hēmacandra flourished in Western India in the twelfth century A.D. In his *Dēśināmamālā* (ii, 12) he gives *karālī* as = *danta-pavana-kāṣṭham*, i.e. the Dēśī word *karālī* means "toothpick".

There does not seem to be any Indo-Aryan word with which this can be connected. It is well known that many of Hēmacandra's Dēśī words are of Dravidian origin, but here also I have been unable to find anything like *karālī*. Mr. Wickremasinghe, whom I consulted on this point, tells me that he, too, has been unable to find anything like it in Dravidian dictionaries.

We are therefore driven to look elsewhere for the origin of this word, and I would suggest the Arabic *خِلَال* *khilāl*, a toothpick—a word which at the present day is in common use in Northern India. The interchange, or metathesis, of *l* and *r* requires no explanation, and the representation of the Arabic *خ* by *ka* need not surprise us in such a borrowed word.

In Hēmacandra's time there had been centuries of intercourse between Arabs and Western India, so that the word could easily have been introduced by Arab merchants or sailors.

G. A. G.

## A NEW BOOK IN MAITHILI

Those of us who may wish to study modern Maithili will be interested to know of a book lately published in that form of speech. It is a short novel called *Rāmēśvara* and is an excellent example of the language.

Maithilī, the principal dialect of Bihārī, is, at the present day, overshadowed by its great neighbour, Hindī, and rarely attains the honour of print. I am depositing a copy of the book in the Library of the Society. Those



who wish to purchase it can obtain it from the author—

Paṇḍit Jibach Miśra,  
Nabtola,  
Manigachi P.O.  
(Darbhanga).

Its price is six annas.

G. A. G.

---

#### A NEW GANGA RECORD

Under this heading Dr. Fleet, in the *Journal* of July, 1915 (pp. 471 ff.), drew attention to "a new and highly interesting record of one of the early Gāṅga rulers of Mysore". It was his intention to edit it in the *Epigraphia Indica*, "and in my paper" (he says) "I shall discuss fully its nature, its date, and its bearing on certain other records of the same series. But" (he added) "as the fixing of the date entails a somewhat long setting out . . . my paper cannot be published at any very early time". He proceeds, however, to give a brief notice of the inscription in order to gratify the eagerness with which an account of it is awaited in certain quarters.

The record consists of a set of three copper plates from Penukoṇḍa in the Anantapur District of Madras; and his estimation of it is as follows: "In its characters, language, and orthography, it stands all the usual tests; and its execution is good throughout . . . my conclusions about it are that we have here at last a genuine early Gāṅga record." He then goes on to point out that the pedigree here given differs in certain points from that which we have in the like records of the same period. "They cannot" (he says) "both be true. This record, however, impresses itself upon us as a genuine one. And we therefore adopt its account of the pedigree, and find here still another reason, and one which ought to be enough in itself, for condemning such of the other records of this

series as are not betrayed at once by their characters or other features."

These records now number thirty-nine,<sup>1</sup> all of which are published, with facsimiles (see my list in *Ep. Ind.*, to appear? vol. xiv). They have been found in all parts of the country, and range in date from about A.D. 240 to 939. They have been labelled by Dr. Fleet as "spurious", which has been repeated by others, following his authority. He has now modified this here by saying that some at least are doubtful. And (in another place) he seems to have anticipated a time when he might be warranted in "abandoning my present views in respect of the Western Ganges, and cancelling anything in my writings about them which would then be wrong".

By his death Dr. Fleet was prevented from continuing the subject in connexion with the record now before us. But I have had in hand (as was indeed the original intention of the discoverer, Mr. Rao Sāhib H. Kṛishṇa Śāstri) the publication of the record itself *in extenso* in the *Epigraphia Indica*, where it will shortly appear. In preparing this version I have been able to point out that the alleged discrepancies in the pedigree can be readily reconciled, and that all the statements regarding it are really uniform. The first two steps are in full agreement with those of all the epigraphs of the Ganga kings. The third king is generally called Harivarman, which in the Tamil form appears as Arivarman. And in one case we have Kṛishṇavarman. But here we have Āyyavarman, that is Āryavarman. These, it is evident, are simply variants of the name Harivarman; for Kṛishṇa is synonymous with Hari, and Āyya or Āryya may be intended for an improvement on Ari. It is with the fourth king that a difficulty presents itself. For he is here said to be Mādhava, the son of Āyyavarman,

<sup>1</sup> Another has since been found, of Polavīra, probably the real name of Mushkara, sixth century (*Mys. Arch. Rep.*, 1918).

whereas all the records are alike in stating that Harivarman's son was Vishṇugōpa, and Mādhava the son of the latter.

How is the omission of Vishṇugōpa to be accounted for? The most conspicuous occurrence of this name is in the Allahabad pillar inscription of Samudragupta, where he is introduced among the conquered kings as Vishṇugōpa of Kāñchi. He was thus a Pallava, and contemporary with Samudragupta, who belongs to the latter part of the fourth century. But we have here to do with a Ganga Vishṇugōpa.

Now all the Ganga plates describe the latter in the same way, as "devoted to the worship of the twice-born, gurus and gods", or "of gurus, cows, and Brāhmaṇs". And it is remarkable to find that the Pallava Vishṇugōpa's father, Skandavarman, is likewise said to have "honoured the gods, twice-born, gurus, and old men". Not only this, but of the Ganga Vishṇugōpa's father, Harivarman, it is uniformly stated that "his fame was tasted by the waters of the four oceans", a phrase which is found in unique connexion with Samudragupta. "One of the habitual expressions" (says Dr. Fleet) "applied always and only to Samudragupta."<sup>1</sup> Vishṇugōpa was thus by no means a negligible person in the Ganga lineage.

That his omission in the Penukoṇḍa plates was accidental is what I am able to show. This becomes clear on examining the text. At the end of line 8 and the beginning of line 9 we have the phrase "devoted to the worship of gods, twice-born, and gurus", with which the inscription goes on as if it were an attribute of Mādhava, the next king. But this is nowhere stated of Mādhava; on the other hand, it is the distinctive characteristic of

<sup>1</sup> For the references see *Early Gupta Inscriptions*, Nos. 1, 4, and 13. An interesting question is the origin of these phrases, and how they came to be applied to rulers in every way so wide apart as Guptas of Magadha in the North and Gangas of Gangavāḍi or Mysore in the South.

Vishṇugōpa and of no other. It is evident, therefore, that Vishṇugōpa was intended to come here, in connexion with this phrase, by the composer of the inscription. But the engraver, whether for the purpose of saving space for the rest, or out of pure carelessness or misunderstanding, went on with it as if part of the description of Mādhava. Vishṇugōpa thus dropped out.

For the question of his date and that of the plates, the before-mentioned coincidences with Samudragupta are a guide. But this and other matters need not be farther considered here, as they are noticed in my article in the *Ep. Ind.* already mentioned. Some interesting help on the subject has come to light in a Jain work bearing so early a Śaka date as 380 (A.D. 458), which has led Dr. Fleet (see *Journal* for October, 1915, pp. 741 ff.) into a long disquisition on the *Mean Place of the Planet Saturn*, with tables for finding the same. But he admits that the astrological details in the literary date work out correctly.

LEWIS RICE.

---

#### NALANDA

The following extracts from the *Annual Report of the Archaeological Survey of India, Eastern Circle, for 1916-17*, by Dr. Spooner, will be of interest to the Society :—

“The exploratory work of the season has been confined to the continuation of the Royal Asiatic Society’s excavations at Nālandā. . . . The balance of the Royal Asiatic Society’s gift of £218, namely Rs. 1,049, was expended this year, together with a sum of Rs. 4,683. . . . I desire to express, again, the Department’s great appreciation of the liberality of the Royal Asiatic Society. In proposing, also, to leave whatever might be found as a gift to the Province of Bihār and Orissa, they have done a signal service to the community.”

As regards results, the excavations at the Southern Monastery, No. 2, have disclosed four buildings of various ages, erected each on the top of the ruins of its predecessor. A twelfth century gold coin was found at the middle level. The remains of "really splendid sculptures" in stone were found, as well as one hand and one foot of a nearly life-size copper or bronze statue of Buddha, with webbed fingers.

The most remarkable object discovered was a "very fine bronze or copper pillar", of unique character, standing over four feet in height. "The lower half is plain, but the upper is fashioned into a sort of capital, showing the form of a recumbent elephant surmounted by a maned lion, upon whose head rest two horizontal discs capped by a lotus bud. . . . It is now in two pieces, the capital having parted from the shaft, but otherwise it is very perfectly preserved." The process of cleaning will disclose whether or not an inscription exists.

Two seals with imperfect royal genealogies were found, and more than twenty seals bear the name of the 'Venerable Community of Monks in the Great Vihāra of Śrī Nālandā'. That discovery confirms the identification of the site.

In one of the monasteries two chambers, with vaulted roofs constructed on the principle of the true arch, look like structural imitations of cave-temples.

The frieze of sculptured panels discovered in the preceding year has been photographed completely.

The operations, regarded as a whole, have been successful, and promise still more interesting results in future.

V. A. S.

---

## NOTICES OF BOOKS

---

THE BEGINNINGS OF BUDDHIST ART, AND OTHER ESSAYS.

By A. FOUCHER. Translated by L. A. THOMAS and F. W. THOMAS, with a preface by the latter. Paris and London, 1917.

Since the publication of vol. i of his *L'Art Gréco-Bouddhique du Gandhāra* in 1905 and of his *Iconographie Bouddhique* in 1900 and 1905, M. Foucher has published from time to time in the *Journal Asiatique*, in the publications of the Musée Guimet, the *Revue Archéologique*, the *Mélanges Sylvain Lévi*, the Bulletin of the *École Française de l'Extrême-Orient* and the *Mémoires* of the *Académie des Inscriptions* a series of essays bearing on various points in Buddhist Art and Archæology. Nine of these essays have been collected, revised by the author, and translated into English by Miss Thomas and Dr. Thomas (who has written a preface for the volume), and are now issued with a very full series of illustrations. We learn that the volume was already in print in 1914, and would have been issued in that year had it not been delayed by the War. The same fate attended the second volume of *L'Art Gréco-Bouddhique*, the first part of which has also now been published.

Of the subjects with which these essays are concerned some are fully dealt with in that work. Among these are IV, "The Greek Origin of the Image of Buddha" (cf. *L'Art G.-B.*, ii, pp. 278-322), and IX, "The Buddhist Madonna" (ib., pp. 102-75). In IX, however, the history of the type of Hārītī is carried on beyond the point with which Gandhāra art is concerned. No. V, "The Tutelary Pair," draws an

interesting comparison between the Indian groups of Pāṇchika and Hārītī as representing the Genius of Wealth and the Goddess of Fertility, and some similar groups belonging to the Romano-Celtic Art of Gaul. Essay No. I, "The Beginnings of Buddhist Art," is also concerned with matters dealt with in the same volume. In Nos. II and III we find full explanations of the Jātaka reliefs of Bharhut and the sculptures of Sāñchī, the two principal sources of our knowledge of what may be called pre-Gandhāra Indian sculpture, in which Hellenic influence can scarcely as yet be detected and in which the image of the Buddha does not appear.

Since the first publication of Cunningham's great work on the Stūpa of Bharhut there has been no such careful examination of the Jātaka scenes there depicted as we find here. One of the Jātakas here touched on (the Shaddanta or six-tusked elephant) is considered in more detail in No. VII, where the various texts in which the story is narrated are brought together, and the unusually full list of sculptured representations is examined at the same time. This favourite Jātaka is found not only at Bharhut, but at Sāñchī, Amrāwatī, and Ajantā, as well as in a Gandhāra frieze. The Bharhut, Amrāwatī, Gandhāra, and Ajantā versions are given in pls. xxix and xxx. The Sāñchī versions will be found in pl. vii of Sir J. Marshall's recently published *Guide to Sāñchī*.

Perhaps the most carefully worked out of all the essays in this volume is No. VI, "The Great Miracle at Śrāvastī," in which M. Foucher proceeds to illustrate more fully the subject on which he has already touched in vol. i of *L'Art Gréco-Bouddhique du Gandhāra*, pp. 534-7.

It is necessary to admit that the identification of the scenes representing this miracle is by no means an easy matter, and to explain many of the reliefs, which show a crowd of figures with no apparent joint action or

connection one with another, is only possible if some undoubted clue can be found which runs through them all. This clue M. Foucher finds in the stele discovered in the excavations at Sārnāth on the site of the Mṛigadāva or "deer-park". Here he considers the Great Miracle to be represented in the second scene from the top on the right side (pl. xix, 1). The passage from the *Divyāvadāna* on which the identification is founded (p. 159) shows that the central idea was that Buddha seated himself on a lotus created by the two Nāga kings, Nanda and Upananda, while Brahmā and Śakra stationed themselves on his right and left, and then "above this lotus he created another on which a Buddha was seated"; and in the same way in front, behind, and at the sides. The crowd of Buddhas in the four consecrated attitudes then rose to the highest heavens. The version of this story as shown on pl. xix, 5 corresponds with the text, though restricting the number of Buddhas to three. This modest and restricted version of the legend seems to have persisted in Eastern India up to the latest Magadha sculptures of the eleventh century, but in Western India the artists, whether in painting or sculpture, as at Ajantā, seem to have preferred an attempt to represent the indefinite multiplication of the Blessed One. This course was also followed in Gandhāra, where we find very elaborate architectural compositions filled with a multitude of figures. This attained its full development in such stelæ as those shown in pls. xxvi, 1, xxvii, and xxviii, 1. The scene is also found represented with dignity in the sculptures of Boro Budur in Java, where the space available allowed it to be treated without overcrowding and with great decorative effect (pl. xxii). We have to thank M. Foucher for his convincing demonstration, which has given a definite meaning to these sculptures hitherto regarded as the result of a rather aimless devotion. They now take their place as



an undoubted representation of a miracle attributed to Buddha, and can no longer be considered simply as crowds of reproductions of the holy images.

In the eighth essay (which first appeared in the *Bulletin de l'École française de l'Extrême-Orient*, vol. ix, 1909) M. Foucher gives an account of his visit to the great *stūpa* of Boro-Budur, followed by a description and interpretation of some sculptures which he has selected as illustrating two legends found in the *Divyāvaśiṣṭa*, viz. those of Prince Sudhana and of King Māndhātara.

The description of the reliefs includes a very full account of those illustrating the legends of Prince Sudhana as set forth in pls. xxxiv and xxxv, and that of Māndhātara, of which an example is given in pl. xxxvi. In No. 2 of the same plate we find in the lower scene what M. Foucher calls "the essential episode of the *Çibi-jātaka*", in which the King ransomed a dove from a falcon at the price of an equal weight of his own flesh. It is indeed remarkable that this important episode, although it is found in the *Mahābhārata*, is altogether lacking in Indian Buddhist literature, although other scenes in King Śivi's life are given in the *Jātaka*. This is still more remarkable when we find that it figures in Indian Buddhist art, and even survives in modern Musalman legend on the north-west frontier of India. It is illustrated in the reliefs from Amrāvati (on the staircase of the British Museum), and I identified the scene in a Gandhāra relief acquired by the British Museum in 1912.<sup>1</sup> The appearance of this story among the sculptures of Boro-Budur is a remarkable proof of its widespread popularity throughout the Buddhist world.

These sculptures are found in the south-eastern and

<sup>1</sup> *Man*, the monthly journal of the Royal Anthropological Institute, Feb. 1913, where it is illustrated in a photographic plate. Till then it had not been found in Gandhāra art, as M. Foucher noted in his vol. i, p. 270.

south-western corners of the stūpa. Passing to the north-western corner, M. Foucher gives a very fully illustrated account (pls. xxxvii–xl) of the historical legend of the conversion of King Rudrāyana and the events which followed. This also is taken from the *Divyāvadāna*. In the following scenes (pl. xli, 1) M. Foucher finds a representation of the story of the pair of Kinnaras in the Bhallāṭiya-jātaka. Of the sculptures near the north-east corner M. Foucher has been able to identify only those relating to the legend of Maitrakanyaka (pl. xli, 2, and pl. xlii). With regard to all these Jātaka tales M. Foucher remarks that their inspiration is purely literary and not popular, and, therefore, that their interpretation is almost impossible without a knowledge not only of the story but of the actual text from which it is taken. A comparison of the scenes illustrated with the interpretations confirms this view. It would, in fact, be impossible without such a guide to form any accurate opinion as to the meaning of most of the scenes. If this diminishes their value as religious documents, however, it does not lessen their artistic merit.

Apart from the Jātakas certain figures require attention, viz. that of the goddess Chundā (pl. xliv) and that of Hārītī (pl. xlviii, 2). Both of these, especially the first, have a very high decorative value.

This essay is a very important contribution to the study of Buddhist iconography in Java, and the illustrations are of great value.

The English translation is excellent, and it is a great convenience to students of Buddhist art in this country to have these valuable essays brought together in such a convenient and well-illustrated form. Most of them are not easily accessible in the journals where they originally appeared. Dr. Thomas in his preface alludes to the "rather limited circle of scholars interested in

Indian Art and Archæology". It is true that the circle is still limited, but it is expanding, and it may be permitted to hope that this volume will contribute to its further enlargement.

Miss Thomas and Dr. Thomas, as well as M. Foucher, must be thanked for this beautiful and illuminating volume.

M. LONGWORTH DAMES.

---

A HISTORY OF THE SIKHS FROM THE ORIGIN OF THE NATION TO THE BATTLES OF THE SUTLEJ. By JOSEPH DAVEY CUNNINGHAM. Edited by H. L. O. GARRETT, M.A., I.E.S., Professor of History, Government College, Lahore. Cr. 8vo, 429 pp. Oxford University Press, 1918. Price 8s. 6d. net.

The Indian Library of reprints issued by the Oxford University Press grows slowly by reason of difficulties arising from the War. It now includes Dubois, *Hindu Manners and Customs*; Bernier, *Travels*; Sleeman, *Rambles and Recollections*; Mrs. Meer Hassan Ali, *Observations on the Mussulmauns of India*; and the new volume which forms the subject of this notice, all good books worthy of the honour of reproduction in a modern garb. Several other works, including Mr. Crooke's edition of Tod's *Annals*, are in hand.

Joseph Davey Cunningham's *History of the Sikhs* appeared in 1849. The second edition, begun in that year and finished in 1851, did not see the light until after the author's death, when it was brought out by his brother Peter, a literary man of considerable distinction. Another brother was Sir Alexander Cunningham, the famous archæologist. The *History* is a memorable book, owing its value less to its style, which is open to adverse criticism in some respects, than to its matter and the daring frankness with which unpopular opinions are expressed. Whatever views may be taken of these

opinions, Cunningham's work still is, and will continue to be, the leading authority on its subject. Mr. Garrett is somewhat scandalized at the unorthodox attitude of the author, with whom he seems to have little in common. A more sympathetic treatment would not have been unwelcome. The editor exceeds the limits of his duty by excising a passage which he considers to be "not only injudicious" but "stultified by the march of events", or "quite untrue under modern conditions" (see Addendum and p. 325 *n.*). Those reasons do not justify the mutilation of the text.

The outstanding distinction of Cunningham's *History* is his passionate devotion to the truth as he visualized it. "Truth alone," says his brother, "influenced the mind and guided the pen of the author of this book." Neither fear nor favour could induce him to spare himself "the ungracious task of declaring displeasing truths". He declared them so vigorously that Lord Dalhousie removed him from his appointment in the Political Department and remanded him to regimental duty. The blow is believed to have hastened Cunningham's death, which occurred suddenly in 1851 at the age of 39. The first edition was suppressed so far as possible on account of the unguarded language of certain passages. The author, while consenting to modify his phraseology in the revised edition, was at pains to explain that "the sense and spirit of what was originally written have been carefully preserved".

He felt warm sympathy with the dislike of the Sikhs to the prospect of absorption in the Company's dominions, and proved without respect of persons that they had good reason for believing their powerful neighbour to be inspired by an aggressive policy. He ascribes the hostile movement of the Sikhs across the Sutlaj in December, 1846, to the overpowering pressure of their fear of annexation, and is not sparing in his criticism of certain

official actions which justified more or less the Sikh apprehensions. The author's willingness to present the enemy's case with perfect candour necessarily colours his narrative with a tinge of seeming hostility to his own countrymen.

Joseph Cunningham was much more than a sentimental sympathizer with the "under dog". He was a keen, shrewd observer, and his opinions deserve respect on their merits. Lord Dalhousie and all his predecessors ignored the obvious danger involved in the failure to maintain strong places with adequate European garrisons, a blunder which cost a heavy price in 1857. Cunningham was wiser in 1849 when he wrote:

"The fewness of places of strength, and indeed of places of ordinary security, for magazines of arms and ammunition is a radical defect in the military system of the English in India."

\*But nobody cared what he wrote on that subject. The doctrine of the "fundamental unity of India", which is now becoming a commonplace of current politics, was not so when Cunningham observed that "Hindustān . . . from Kābul to the valley of Assam and the island of Ceylon is regarded as one country, and dominion in it is associated in the minds of the people with the predominance of one monarch or of one race". Other penetrating and judicious observations are not infrequent in the book. If he was inclined to take a gloomy view of the future of the English in India, whose "dominion rests tremblingly upon the convulsed ocean of social change and mental revolution", his anxieties were not without reason, and were justified in large part eight years later. He could not foresee the happier spirit displayed in the days of the Great War. We may all join in the aspiration with which he concludes his book that the wisdom of the Legislature may evolve "a government of freedom and progress".

The editor has done his work with restraint and in a satisfactory manner on the whole. A few more notes in certain places would have been an improvement. For instance, the statement (p. 27 *n.* and elsewhere) that Muhsin Fānī wrote the *Dabistān* is erroneous (see *Akbar*, p. 465 *n.*), and some of the annotations on the history of religions and other miscellaneous subjects are hardly up to date. On p. 287 the word "first" in line 9 should be amended to "just".

V. A. S.

---

TANGKHUL NAGA GRAMMAR AND DICTIONARY (UKHRUL DIALECT), with illustrative sentences. By Rev. W. PETTIGREW. pp. 476. Shillong: Government Press. Price 4s. 6d.

This is a thorough and practical study of the principal dialect of an interesting group of Naga tribes inhabiting the hills north-east of the valley of Manipur, written by the Rev. W. Pettigrew, an American missionary who has lived in the village of Ukhrul since 1896.

A sketch of Tangkhul Naga grammar appeared in vol. iii, pt. ii, of the Linguistic Survey of India, when it was assigned to the Naga Kuki group of the Tibeto-Burman family of Indo-Chinese languages. The classification of these languages in accordance with sound philological and phonetic principles is a task of considerable magnitude, which for the credit of British scholarship must soon be taken in hand. Certain features of grammatical construction are clearly marked. The system of numbers is decimal. The negative is formed by a prefix *ma*, and in some cases, which are interesting but have to be extracted from the illustrations, the negative is both prefixed and suffixed to the verbal root. The use of infixes, prefixes, and suffixes is conspicuous. Shades of meaning are thus expressed which convey

a high degree of precision and definition of verbal action. In these general respects it differs in no degree from other Tibeto-Burman dialects. The author's intimate knowledge of Meithei has enabled him to point to many interesting parallels and similarities. Tangkhul, however, differs from Meithei in its numerical system and in the method of forming the negative, both important characteristics. It agrees in respect of the formation of the relative, and of the distinction between questions involving a direct or an extended answer, in the general order of sentences, and in general vocabulary.

The author points out the existence of two tones as in Manipuri "in a great number of words which to the ignorant sound the same". There are other words which he tells us "are sounded alike and only the context can decide what is referred to". He notes, too, that "unlike Manipuri, where emphasis or stress on words is made known by the addition of emphatic particles, Tangkhul Naga depends more on intonation of words and on adverbial forms infixed to the verb". "A distinct tendency exists to aspirate *k* in the otiose particles *ka* and *kha*," but while there would appear to be no "hard and fast rule regarding the aspirating or non-aspirating" of these particles, "it will be noticed in the dictionary that all words whose verbal roots begin with an *l*, *m*, *n*, *r*, *u*, *v*, *w*, or *y* have the aspirated otiose particle *kh*," not a bad collection as a foundation for a rule. On the subject of pronunciation it may be noted that *th* is pronounced as in "hot-house". Are we to infer that *kh* and *ph* are pronounced as in "back hand" and "strap-hanger"? Is this pronunciation used for both initial and medial positions? *Eo*, too, is pronounced as in "egeo" (Latin). There's a rub! Is the Latin pronunciation that of twenty years ago or the revised system which has had the recent blessing of the Board of Education? *Z*, too, is pronounced as in English, but the unwary

should be cautious, since in the dialect which forms the substance of the grammar *z* should be pronounced as *ts* in "parts". (p. 2). The remarks as to noticeable changes of vowels (p. 3) are not very clear. It will, I think, be admitted that accurate scientifically prepared records of the pronunciation of these dialects would be of great importance to students of phonetics. They would clear up misunderstandings on the part of the zealous but ignorant student as to what is really meant by tones, intonations, emphasis, and stress. It may be found that our ultimate classification of these Tibeto-Burman dialects will have to proceed largely on the data of phonetic variations recorded by scientific modern means.<sup>1</sup> Languages such as these are often unstable and are liable to be affected by all that affects the social life of the community. And a simple, clear, straightforward system of tone notation is also greatly to be desired.

The dictionaries contain much that is of interest to the student of Indian social conditions at this level. Although in the English-Tangkhul part the word "to kill" is given as *shokathat* (which does not appear in the Tangkhul-English part) and as *taikathat* (which is given in the Tangkhul-English portion as *taikathata*<sup>2</sup> = slayer of animals), I find in the Tangkhul-English portion thirty-five words nearly all containing the root *that* (which is a common Kuki root, cf. Meithei *hāt*), denoting various ingenious methods of killing animals and human beings. It would hardly do to infer that the Nagas had made great advances in the study of Constitutional Reform from the presence in the dictionary of Tangkhul phrases for Prime Minister, Vice-President, Ministry, and Parliament, or that their educational system had attained to

<sup>1</sup> Is there in Tangkhul an aspirated *l*, *m*, *n*, as in other languages in this area? The absence of such aspirated letters may prove to be a fact of cardinal importance to those who may be tempted to classify these languages by their phonetics.

<sup>2</sup> The suffix *a* should be noted.



the dignity of a University, with colleges, tutors, and a stationer, or that their knowledge of the Navy and the sea was extensive and profound, as on p. 368. For an infinite variety of combination, condensation, humour, and insight, I suggest a perusal of pp. 258-9, where the variants clustering round the root *hāng* are duly recorded. The psychology of the people is sketched in outline in pp. 394-9, which deal with the root *ning* (in Manipuri=to wish or desire). Here and there, in the thumbnail notes describing the knowledge possessed by these people of simple surgery or of the medicinal properties of jungle trees and herbs and of the anatomy of the human frame, are facts supremely interesting to the sociologist as evidence of the real nature and extent of their culture. In the words denoting social relations is material for the reconstruction of the principles on which semi-civilized societies such as this are or have been built up. The mother-in-law and the paternal aunt are *anī*. The father-in-law, the maternal uncle, the grandfather, and the great-grandfather are all *awo*. The grandmother (which one?—maternal? paternal? or both?) and the mother's brother's wife are *ayī*. A male cousin is *igāto*, and the same word is used for the younger brother. *Achei* is a brother-in-law and a nephew, as well as the name given to all male and female below the rank of chiefs. *Amui* is the husband's sister and the brother's wife as well. *Imāk* is the brother-in-law and the son's wife's father. Cross cousin marriage may be suspected as well as other forms of marriage organization. *Kathima* (p. 294) means surely a disinterested witness—not quite the same thing as an uninterested witness. The word "otorrhœa" (earache) is spelt "orrtorrhœa" on pp. 358 and 377. On p. 308 *khamayut*, to pull off (as a rat's "tale"—*sic*), is an obvious slip which the printer should have noticed. How the word *khangacha eina sakahai* (p. 309) can mean both "accustomed" and "unaccustomed"

is a little difficult to understand. The proof-reading has left a good deal to be desired, and pp. 439 to 446 are bound in twice.

Apart from the minor blemishes which have been noted, the book contains a straightforward and reasonably clear account of the grammar; and the dictionaries at the end are full of interest, philological as well as sociological.

Whether the Tangkhul Nagas who have been in France during the War will take back with them new words, as they will surely take back new experiences and new ideas as to killing their enemies, has yet to be seen. I came across a party of them some six months ago in the neighbourhood of a large and important ammunition depot, when I had the pleasure of a few minutes' talk with them in Meithei, which some of them spoke quite well.

T. C. HODSON, Colonel.

---

#### SOME SEMITIC RITES OF MOURNING AND RELIGION.

STUDIES ON THEIR ORIGIN AND MUTUAL RELATION.

By A. J. WENSINCK. *Verhandelingen der Koninklijke Akademie van Wetenschappen te Amsterdam.* pp. 101. Johannes Müller, 1917.

The subject dealt with in this book justly claims the interest of students of comparative religion, and Oriental religions in particular. Although the author apparently did not intend to treat the matter exhaustively, he has given a fairly complete survey of the religious aspect of the rites of mourning as practised in the tents of Shem. The connexion between mourning and religion is an easily explained psychological phenomenon, because the mourner sees himself brought into direct contact with higher powers over which he has no control.

The first topic of the book is the use of the thrashing-floor both for mourning and marriage ceremonies. As to the former the author sees in it "a symbolic

representation of the intrinsic connection between the dead and the earth", whilst as to the latter it "seems to have been the symbol of the fertile earth". Now, however plausible this appears to be at the first glance, we also find that the thrashing-floor was the prototype of the court of justice, for we read that the Synhedrion sat in the semicircle of half (the space of) the thrashing-floor (Mishnāh, Sanh. iv, 3), faced by several rows of disciples. It seems that the thrashing-floor was chosen on account of the room it afforded and its accessibility. In the Old Testament it is the gate, or rather the open space within the gate, which served as court. It is therefore in the gate, where Boaz performs the ceremony of his marriage with Ruth (ch. iv). On the other hand, David's mourning for Abner is conducted near the grave of the latter, and "the whole people" came to offer him the meal of the mourners. All this makes a mystical connexion between the thrashing-floor and the ceremonies in question somewhat doubtful. The leading idea seems rather to have been publicity. This is strongly supported by several statements in the Old Testament, apart from the one just mentioned in the case of David. Boaz selects ten men to act as witnesses. The instance from the two kings meeting on "the thrashing-floor at the gate of Samaria" (1 Kings xxii), quoted by our author, has scarcely any other meaning than publicity. For so large a gathering (v. 6) of 400 prophets and the retinues of the two kings a wide space was necessary. Here we have the gate and the thrashing-floor together, but we read nothing of magical or religious rites performed, except the effusions of the prophets and the symbolic production of the iron horns. Publicity is also one of the main features of Jewish marriage ceremonies to such an extent that even to this day many such ceremonies are performed in the open air. As to burial scenes, we read in the Mishnāh (Berakhōth, iii, 2) that on his return from the newly filled

grave the mourner walks through an avenue of comforting friends, which ceremony is considered so important that those standing in the front rows are absolved from various religious duties. Mr. Wensinck rightly quotes the report given in the Mishnāh that the prayer for rain was recited in the market-place, but this again speaks for publicity. Thus it cannot be definitely stated that the thrashing-floor was the scene of rites of mourning and religion among Israel. For post-Biblical times this can be absolutely denied.

Of greater interest is what the author says on the topic of standing in the presence of a bier. Jewish custom even goes further; for the Talmud teaches that whoever meets a funeral procession and does not join offends against Prov. xvii, 15. Whether standing as a mark of respect paid to a living or dead person may be styled a religious rite, cannot be said absolutely. The verse Gen. xxiii, 3 does not support such a view, and Lev. xix, 32 all but suggests the general abeyance of the custom of standing up for an old man, otherwise there would not have been any necessity to enjoin it. The motives of customs such as these naturally vary among different nations. What with one was ethical rather than religious, may with another have been prompted by superstition and fear, and it is therefore advisable not to dub everything indiscriminately a religious rite. The author entirely omits to mention the custom of using musical instruments in connexion with burials. Among the Jews the flute not only played an important part in various religious ceremonies, as the offering up of the firstfruits and during the Feast of Tabernacles, but also at weddings and funerals. According to the Mishnāh (Kethūbhoth, iv, 4) even a poor man should provide at least two flutes for a funeral. No evidence seems to exist of a similar custom among the Arabs and other Semitic nations.

As to watching the dead, apart from reasons of sentiment, the necessity of protecting the corpse from injury by animals and robbers was sufficient to have it carefully guarded. Ibn Hishām's description of the death and burial of Moḥammed is silent on this point. Among Jews the custom of watching is rigorously practised to this day, and the author could have procured fuller information on this matter than he gained from Bodenschatz, who wrote more than 150 years ago, and was not very well informed himself.

Very interesting are the author's remarks concerning Invocation, but he is scarcely justified in reading תוכיר, according to the Peshittā (Exod. xx, 24) for אֹכִיר. The Greek version has ἐπονομάσω, which is more authentic. The alteration also weakens the ethical meaning of the phrase, otherwise the thief and the robber might procure divine approval by a simple act of invocation. On the whole the author has not improved here upon Schwally's *Leben nach dem Tode* on the same topic.

As to vigils, the author omits to mention that the High Priest was not permitted to sleep during the night of the Day of Atonement, but was kept awake by the priests. This also applies to Qorān, Sūra lxxiii, with the traditions connected therewith. In the chapter on "Burning of Lights" we miss any allusion to the fine parable Qorān xxiv, 35. In this parable Moḥammed evidently described a reminiscence, having probably seen an eternal lamp in some place of worship. In the chapter on circumambulation the author presents a new theory that this was done in a limping gait. In connexion with this he makes the extraordinary statement that in Gesenius-Buhl's lexicon the etymology of פסח is given with the meaning of "to sprain". A closer examination, however, will show that this explanation only refers to 1 Kings xviii, 26, and as a possibility only, whilst פסח is translated by "to pass by". In Arabic فسح, to which

the author refers, indeed, means "to dislocate, to remove", but it is much more appropriate to connect פסח with فسح, "to be spacious, to make wide steps" (Lane). Of a limping circumambulation there is no evidence in ancient Eastern religions, neither is it "evident" that the proto-Semitic feast of spring was also celebrated with circumambulations. The only analogy in Western countries is furnished by the famous dancing procession at Echternach.

The chapter on Neglect of Appearance is another interesting topic. Whether קרר (Ps. xxxv, 14) really means "a state of dirtiness" is not quite certain; it might just as well be translated "mournfully". The Greek version has σκυθρωπάων οὕτως ἐταπεινούμην, whilst the Peshittā renders it by ܠܝܬܝ ܥܝܢܝ ܕܡܝܬܝܢ. We might here also compare the passage Qorān xvi, 60: "When one of them is informed of (the birth of) a daughter his face becomes black and is choked with rage." See further, Lamentations iv, 8. Abstinence from bathing and washing evidently means renunciation of comfort. In the Talmudic prohibition quoted by our author, only bathing the whole body is denied to the mourner, whilst the washing of single limbs is not interfered with entirely. As to dress, sacred or otherwise, there is among post-Biblical Jews very little in connexion with religious rites, except the white surplice worn in many places during the divine service on the Day of Atonement, and which is used as a shroud after death. This custom is not known to Spanish and Oriental Jews, and is probably not very old. At any rate there is no uniformity in the matter and no fixed rule either. As to אזור, the author does not seem to have seen the late Professor Robertson Smith's lucid article in JQR. iv, pp. 289 sqq. On the *izār* as feminine garment, see Sprenger, *Mohammed*, iii, p. 63, rem. 1. The so-termed praying shawl (*tallith*) originally had no religious character, and only acquired it by usage, without

being compulsory. What the author quotes on this topic from Bodenschatz is again inadequate as a source in a modern work of research. He should have added that the *tallith* can only be used as a shroud after having been deprived of its ritual character by thinning out the *šišith*.

The author finally discusses a number of topics such as shaving the head, setting tombstones, removal of shoes, and fasting. His comments on these subjects might be augmented here and there on some minor point, but on the whole he has presented what was necessary to the reader. One must bear in mind that human emotions tend to find expression in outward appearance and emblematic actions. Many of these might be relegated to the realm of folklore, but as ancient Semitic life was thoroughly permeated by religion no line of demarcation can be drawn. The field in which the author laboured is a very wide one, and its paths are not delineated with absolute strictness. Hence the few supplements and differences of opinion expressed in these pages. The author betrays a sound knowledge of the languages and literatures involved, and deserves the thanks, not only of students of Semitic lore, but also of those in search of material for comparison with the customs and manners of other nations.

H. HIRSCHFELD.

---

THE EXPANSION OF BRITISH INDIA (1818-58). By G. ANDERSON, M.A., Professor of History, Elphinstone College, Bombay; and M. SUBEDAR, B.A., B.Sc., Professor of Political Economy at the University of Calcutta. London: G. Bell & Sons. 1918. Price 4s. 6d.

The fashion of compiling "source-books", long prevalent in the history schools of British universities, has spread to India, where many books of the kind have appeared recently. The latest is that now noticed. It must be

serviceable, as all works of its class are, each in its degree. In India, where the habit of memorizing all branches of learning has prevailed from immemorial antiquity, the study of history, as the compilers note, "has been degraded by the use, or rather abuse, of text-books," which are learned by heart. Hopes are entertained that insistence on the intelligent reading of "source-books" may check the abuse.

The work of Messrs. Anderson and Subedar, although, as already said, of some merit, cannot be commended unreservedly. Many of the extracts are not, as they purport to be, "excerpts from original sources."

For example, Keene's summary (p. 15) of the dispatch, dated June 25, 1836, on which the Afghan war policy was based, should be replaced by quotation of the material passages from the text, as printed by Sir Auckland Colvin in the biography of his father, John Colvin (*Rulers of India*, p. 87). Sir William Napier's description of the battle of Miānī (p. 27) is not an original source. Nor is Edwin Arnold's commentary on Lord Dalhousie's administration (p. 39). Many other examples of the same misnomer occur. Numerous documents are not dated, e.g. those on pp. 23, 31, 32, 36, etc. The extracts are not numbered and there is no index.

The connecting comment is open to much criticism. The assertion (p. 22) that Lord Auckland was recalled is erroneous. His successor, Lord Ellenborough, was appointed in the ordinary course. The recall of Lord Ellenborough, an important event from the constitutional point of view, is not mentioned.

On p. 32 the phrase "It was somewhat natural after all that had happened that Dost Muhammed should use his opportunities of revenge and take part in the Sikh wars" implies that the Dost did so take part. As a matter of fact, he did not. The brief "tripartite treaty" should have been cited textually. The chronological sequence



of the extracts is often broken, with confusing results, a defect greatly against the use of the book by teachers. The action of Commodore Lambert which brought on the second Burmese war is not mentioned. Lord Dalhousie wrote: "There is no doubt that Lambert was the *immediate* cause of the war by seizing the king's ship in direct disobedience of his orders from me." But Lambert was sure that "Palmerston would have approved", and was right, because he got his promotion. The expression of opinions is more than once flabby and undecided. The Sind business was not of "doubtful morality" (p. 26). It was a crime and should be branded as such. Lord Auckland, through his secretary, avowed the "scrap of paper" doctrine with cynical frankness, saying: "While the present emergency lasts, you may apprise the Ameers that the Article of the Treaty with them, prohibitory of using the Indus for the conveyance of military stores, must necessarily be suspended during the course of operations undertaken for the permanent establishment of security to all those who are parties to that Treaty." The document thus violated was not seven years old.

Historians should not be afraid to tell the truth and to condemn wrongdoing without respect of persons. Many other observations of a critical nature might be made.

---

V. A. S.

THE DATES OF SKANDAGUPTA AND HIS SUCCESSORS. By PANNA LALL, M.A., B.Sc., LL.B., I.C.S. (Reprinted from the *Hindustan Review* for January, 1918.)

Mr. Panna Lall's closely reasoned paper demands my special attention because my studies of Gupta history, chronology, and numismatics began thirty-five years ago, and I am bound, as the historian of Hindu India, to form and express a definite opinion on the conclusions

formulated in an essay which has an important bearing upon Gupta history. The author disagrees with views which I have advocated, and differs from Fleet in the interpretation of the well-known Mandasor record, No. 18 of Fleet's book.

I do not propose to take up by detailed discussion space which can be ill spared, and may say at once that, after careful study of Mr. Panna Lall's arguments and re-examination of all the relevant documents, I accept his conclusions and abandon any contrary opinions recorded in my various publications.

The result is that—

1. Hiuen Tsang's account of Bālāditya of Magadha and his alleged defeat of the Hun king Mihiragula(-kula) must be discarded as unhistorical, although possibly founded on fact. He heard the story from monks in the Panjāb, and it is impossible to say how the legend originated.<sup>1</sup> The apparent necessity for assigning a late date to Kumāragupta II thus disappears.


2. The Imperial Gupta Dynasty included only two kings named Kumāragupta, not three, as recent discoveries had seemed to indicate.

3. Budhagupta was a powerful king of the Imperial Gupta Dynasty, whose dominions included Benares and Dinājpur in Bengal, as well as the western provinces.

4. Combining Mr. Panna Lall's results with those of Professor Pathak (*Bhandarkar Commemoration Volume*), we may affirm that Mihiragula's father, Toramāna, reigned in India for two or three years from A.D. 500 to 502. His coins dated 52 belong to the first year of his Indian reign, and the era is the Hun era of 448, as determined long ago by M. Drouin (*Journal Asiatique*, 1890. See also V. A. Smith, JASB., vol. lxiii, pt. i, p. 33, 1894). Mihiragula died in A.D. 542.

<sup>1</sup> Mr. Allan gives a plausible explanation (*B.M. Catalogue, Gupta Dynasties*, 1914, p. 56).

5. The resultant probable genealogy and succession of the kings of the Imperial Gupta Dynasty from Kumāragupta I to Budhagupta inclusive are as follows :—



6. The position of the princes who struck rude coins with the names or titles of

Prakāśāditya,  
Dvādaśāditya,  
Ghaṭo[tkacha]gupta, and  
Viṣṇu[gupta]

is uncertain.

Some or all of the names or titles may be mere alternatives for the names given in the genealogies, e.g. Viṣnugupta and Prakāśāditya may be identical, because the Prakāśas were the *dūtas* or messengers of Viṣṇu (Dowson), and both appellations *may* belong to Puragupta. Such details, as well as others, must remain undetermined at present.

V. A. S.

---

A GAZETTEER OF KULU. (Punjab District Gazetteers, Vol. XXX: Kangra District, Part II, Kulu and Sarāj; Part III, Lahul; Part IV, Spiti.) Lahore, 1917. Price 6s. 2d.

The official title of this work, as given in brackets, is a little misleading. It is a Gazetteer of the Kulu Sub-division, which includes the Sarāj or highlands north of

the Sutlej and Simla, the Kulu valley formed by the uppermost reach of the Beās, the semi-Tibetan canton of Lahul, and the purely Tibetan canton of Spiti. In the present work the Gazetteer of 1898 has been completely re-arranged and brought up to date, with the assistance of Dr. J. Hutchison, of the Chamba Mission, in history and other topics, of the Rev. H. Kunick, of the Moravian Mission at Kyelang, in Parts III and IV, and of Mr. R. E. Cooper in the Flora. It is also illustrated by photographs, the gift of Mr. J. Coldstream, I.C.S. But a great deal more assistance might have been obtained from investigators like Capt. G. C. Howell, I.C.S., whose historical researches are not alluded to, and Sir James B. Lyall, on whose classic but uncompleted *Settlement Report* the work is really founded.

The Kulu Valley has been described as perhaps the most beautiful of all the Himalayan valleys, and it is certainly one of the most interesting to the student of early Hinduism. Kulāntapīṭha, roughly corresponding to a *wazīrī* called Parol on the east bank of the upper Beās, is described in a MS. said to be part of the *Brahmāṇḍa-purāṇa* (*sic*), though Kulu, it is asserted, is not derived from that name, but from Kulūta, a term of unknown origin. From Kulu the people are called Kolā (orig. \*Kauluā), but Sanskrit authors, whose works are not cited, speak of the Kulindas or Kunindas, a term which cannot seriously be taken as the parent of Kanet, the principal middle caste met with in Kulu proper, but also in Sarāj, the Simla Hill States, and Mandī. Kulūta had a king named Virāyasa, in the first century A.D., but he does not appear in the *vansāvalī* or genealogical tree of the kings, the first line of whom bore the suffix Pāl, and ruled till about 1500 A.D. After that the suffix was changed to Singh, an alteration summarily dismissed as of "no consequence". It synchronized, however, more or less with the importation or recruitment of militant

Bairāgī faqīrs by the Kulu Rājās, and possibly connoted a real change in their constitutional position. Prior to their appearance the country had been organized in a loosely conceived feudal system, local rānās holding semi-independent fiefs of the Rājās. One of these was Makarsa, Makarāsa or -āha, which seems to be the original form of Megarsus or the name given to the Sutlej by Dionysius Periergetes. A comparison with the name Dauphiné at once suggests itself. The significance of the *makara* in Indian mythology has been recently discussed by Professor Elliot Smith in *Man*.

The religions of Kulu are briefly discussed in this work, but they would require a volume to describe them fully. Attention may be called to the cults of the Nāgs, who number eighteen, equalling the Narains in multitude. Eighteen is a conventional term, probably equivalent to our "score", and a proverb speaks of the "eighteen castes" in Nagar. Little has been added to our knowledge of caste in Kulu since Sir J. B. Lyall and Mr. Alexander Anderson described its system, but an intensive local study of caste and folk-beliefs in the subdivision would doubtless yield a rich harvest and throw much light on primitive Hinduism as a social and religious organization. The Kanet caste is the backbone of the population, and it has rarely been recruited from a foreign stock. The imported elements are almost exclusively Tibetan, at least in historical times, and the curious connexion of the Rā-deo, the primitive people of the remote Malāna glen, with the Muhammadan Shāh Madār is clearly not due to Moslem immigration. Indeed, the god of Malāna, Jamlu, is only sacrificed to with Muhammadan rites at his temples in the Kulu Valley, not at Malāna itself, and the legend about Akbar only seems to preserve a grateful recollection of his tolerance. He is actually worshipped on the 12th of Phāgan.

The Parts which deal with Lahul and Spiti are excellent

in their way, though they are mainly reproductions of Sir J. B. Lyall's work. Lahul has been partly Hinduized, but Spiti is still Buddhist, and looks to Lhāsa and other centres in Tibet for its culture. In Lahul Buddhist influence is now weak, but traces of it and of even more primitive cults survive. The account of the Buddhist sects or orders in Spiti requires revision in the light of recent research, so it must be used with caution.

The work, a mine of information to the student of things Indian, has an index and three useful maps.

H. A. R.

---

EDOUARD CHAVANNES. Par M. HENRI CORDIER, membre de l'Institut. Extrait du *Journal Asiatique* (Mars-Avril, 1918). Paris: Imprimerie Nationale.

This is a *tirage à part* of fifty-one pages, extracted from the *Journal Asiatique*, by M. Cordier, the distinguished and lifelong friend of Chavannes, and since 1904 the joint editor of the *T'oung Pao* with the latter. It has, therefore, the authority and value derived from the peculiar qualifications of M. Cordier to speak with full knowledge of his subject, and from the profound sympathy that evidently bound together the two scholars. The separate publication of this memoir will be a matter of gratitude to very many admirers of Chavannes who might not otherwise have had occasion to read it, especially as besides being a commented biography of the deceased sinologue, it provides a complete bibliography, filling twenty-two pages, of everything that Chavannes had written on Chinese topics since 1889 up to the time of his death, including almost numberless reviews and necrologies.

In this pamphlet is related the career of a superb modern scholar, who followed tirelessly the research he had himself chosen, who devoted to it without stint his

time, the best of his exceptional powers, and, as now plainly appears, taxed his strength and health so unsparingly for it that when severe illness seized him in middle life his vitality was exhausted, and he sank to rest at the summit of his success. "Chavannes avait accompli en vingt-cinq ans une tâche qui aurait demandé une longue vie d'homme ordinaire," writes M. Cordier. "Il était surmené."

What contributes a particular interest to this memoir is that M. Cordier's own knowledge of the history and general bearing of the subjects to which Chavannes at successive periods applied his industry and highly trained qualifications, is itself exact and independent. He is able, therefore, as we read of the many fields, historical, ethnological, Buddhistic, geographic, artistic, epigraphic, explored and illuminated by his friend, to trace for the reader the general nature of the question attacked and the bearings of the research on the lines of the advance of knowledge in each such province of sinology.

In all, he shows us Chavannes persistently working, constantly increasing the burden of his labours, while adding day by day to the sum of our information and the value of our learning, perpetually appealed to, never refusing, never shrinking, never sparing himself, always indeed a true child of France, as we have come to know her in these dreadful but revealing years of the great war.

L. C. HOPKINS.

---

THE TURKS OF CENTRAL ASIA. By M. A. CZAPLICKA.  
Oxford: Clarendon Press. 1918.

This work is an interesting sketch of the ethnography of the Turks of Central Asia and Siberia. It may not add much to what scholars know, but probably no work in the English language contains in small compass so much information about the Mongolian and Tartar

tribes. Its defect is in not taking a quite dispassionate view of its subject. Its author has a thesis to maintain, and her book is mainly an enlargement of a semi-political lecture. What she seeks to show is that the Ottoman Turks of the present day have no right to claim kindred with Central Asian Turks, and that the claim to this effect put forward by writers among the young Turk party and their German allies is untenable. I do not think she has made out her case; on the contrary, it seems to me that the modern Ottomans are legitimate descendants of the Turks of Mongolia, and that their desire to "search out the ancient mother" (*antiquam exquirere matrem*<sup>1</sup>) is natural and laudable. It cannot be denied that Central Asia was the original home of the Ottoman race; nor can it be maintained that the bulk of this race has lost the courage and patriotism of their ancestors. The Turks of Constantinople were a magnificent people in the fifteenth and sixteenth centuries; at an earlier period Bāyazid *İlderim* was a rival worthy of Timūr, and his descendant Sulaimān the Magnificent was a Turk of whom Bābur might have been proud. Indeed, it seems that Miss Czaplicka has unwittingly given away her case when she says that the Ottoman ruling classes have entirely lost touch with the Turkish masses they rule, masses which, it seems, "through their backwardness, preserve more of their national traditions." And what is this but to admit that the common people of the Ottomans are still genuine chips of the old block of Central Asian Turks? To be sure Miss Czaplicka seeks to evade this inference by asserting that the masses also have lost their Asiatic character, through admixture with the races of Asia Minor and S.E. Europe. How residence in Asia Minor could destroy Asiatic character she does not explain. I presume she will not deny that the Seljūks were a Central Asian tribe which advanced gradually

<sup>1</sup> The Delian Apollo's direction to the Trojans.



through Brusa into Europe. Moreover, the "Chaghataī-Turkī" of 'Alī-sher *Nawā'ī* and of Bābur is substantially one with Ottoman-Turkish, a circumstance of weight against Miss Czaplicka's argument.

To her list (p. 26) of the monuments of "Chaghataī-Turkī", namely, the writings of 'Alī-sher, Bābur, and Abū'l-ghāzī, might have been added Muḥammad *Ṣāliḥ's* *Shaibānī-nāma*, and to her legends (p. 14) of the origin of Mughūls and Tārtārs, the most poetical of all, that of the virgin-widow Alanqūā. She mentions (p. 15) that the current version of the origin of the Turks traces them back to Oghūz Khān, but his date is far below that of the eponymous ancestor of the Turks, who was Turk, eldest son of Japhet, son of Noah.

Miss Czaplicka's bibliography of books relating to the early Turks must have cost much trouble and research; it is a very valuable piece of work and seems to be the first attempt at such a list. That it could be added to is no disparagement. It has the not unusual mistake (p. 129) of attributing to Col. Miles a translation of Abū'l-ghāzī's *Shajarat-i-Turk*. [Miles' work is an abridged translation of one by Ūlūgh Beg Mirzā *Shāhrukhī*, one also dealing with the genealogy of the Turks.] It might have been noted (also on p. 129) that Fræhn edited an imprint of the *Shajarat-i-Turk*.

HENRY BEVERIDGE.

*Note.*—Miss Czaplicka can be excused readily for not knowing the *Bābur-nāma* so well as to avoid the mistake of styling its author "Mīrzā Baber" (i.e. Bābur Mīrzā), the mistake lying in his having assumed the title "Bābur Pādshāh" (in 913 A.H.—1508 A.D.) before any part of that book was penned. It can, however, be merely by a slip that on p. 26 stands "Baber the Mogol", while on p. 75 his direct paternal ancestor Tīmūr is described as "purely Turki" in blood.—A. S. B.

PENCIL SPEAKINGS FROM PEKING. By A. E. GRANTHAM.  
pp. 295. London: George Allen & Unwin. 1918.

All the nations which in the far distant past rose to pre-eminence by the extent of territory they ruled and the high plane of civilization to which they attained, such as the Assyrians, the Egyptians, the Greeks, and the Romans, succumbed in the course of time to the enervating influence of that civilization and crumbled one after the other into dust. Alone China, whose existence as a nation dates from before the dawn of history, has maintained till recent years its proud position in Eastern Asia as "The Central Kingdom of Civilization", to which all neighbouring countries looked up as their acknowledged head, and from which they derived their philosophy and art. What is it, then, that has enabled China to avoid the fate which has overtaken all other nations and to prolong its existence as a homogeneous nation over so vast a period? This is the question to which Mr. Grantham endeavours to find an answer in his *Pencil Speakings from Peking*; and as the result of a detailed survey of (mainly) the psychological side of Chinese history, he concludes that the long life of China as a nation is due to the influence throughout her borders of the teachings of "Laotsze, who articulates the soul, and of Confucius, who articulates the intellect, of ancient China" (p. 204). In his own words:

"When, face to face with the puzzle of the Universe, they [Confucius and Laotsze] discovered for man's guidance among the bewildering myriad of things the *Tao*, the divine Way, the inner reality which creates and maintains life; when they saw holiness in Heaven, and Earth and Man; when they said 'Equilibrium is the foundation of the world, harmony its great thoroughfare'; when they made the cultivation of humaneness and sincerity, of reverence for the feelings of others and for the moral dignity of one's own personality, the highest goal of human endeavour; then surely it must be admitted that their

main bearings were absolutely right, that they directed the people's aspirations, not towards hollow idols of the market-place, panacea suitable for the ills of an hour, but to objects of immortal significance exceeding in value, outlasting in time, the rattle of ballot-boxes, the power of armaments, the speed of railways, the precision of machinery, the exploitation of mineral wealth which spreads such a din in the up-to-date world, such hurry and such hatreds in the up-to-date soul. And because they build on the only foundation that never gives way, spiritual rectitude, their race persisted as a living entity through all the disintegrating influences of political disasters, foreign conquests, and periodic lassitude—for more than twenty centuries."

The view hitherto generally held by sinologues has been that, while due homage must be rendered to the noble and lofty aims of the teachings of her ancient Sages, China's longevity as a nation is to be attributed to the admirable system of competitive examinations for admission into the Civil service that has been maintained for many centuries. Their arguments may be stated thus:—

The original seat of the Chinese people appears to have been in the country now known as the province of Chihli. History states that the Emperor Yao (B.C. 4200) had his capital at Chinchow, about 100 miles south of the present Peking. Spreading southward and westward, it was not till about B.C. 800 that the Chinese, by penetration and conquest, had occupied the country down to the Yangtsze; and in the country south of that river, though conquered by the Emperor Shih of the Chin dynasty, who ascended the throne B.C. 221, Chinese authority was not fully consolidated till the T'ang dynasty, which began A.D. 618 and reigned for 300 years.

The principle that good government consists in getting the services, as officers, of "*hsien neng*, the worthy and talented, the good and able", has been distinctly taught, and more or less practically enforced, from the earliest

periods of Chinese history. For the Chinese early recognized the psychological fact, the law of nature, that while there is on the one hand an intimate connexion between ignorance and vice, so on the other hand high intellectual faculties are as a general rule associated with moral elevation. Accordingly, they resolved to sift out the highly intellectual, by a system of competitive examinations, for employment as officers of state. In the form this system assumed under the T'ang dynasty, an examination of scholars for the degree of Bachelor was held by the Educational Examiner of the province twice in three years in each departmental city (*fu*); once in three years the successful Bachelors presented themselves at the provincial capital before a special examiner appointed by the Emperor for examination for the degree of Licentiate; and again once in three years the successful Licentiates from all the provinces might attend the metropolitan examination at Peking for the degree of Doctor. In each of these examinations the successful candidates represented but a small percentage of the competitors; their intellectual capacity was consequently of a very high standard. The Licentiates were eligible for office after a few years waiting; the Doctors were entitled without delay to a district magistracy at least.

All Chinese law is codified. Some parts of it are as old as the Chinese administrative system itself; and one of the oldest of the codes, and by the people most venerated, is that which most nearly affects themselves, the penal. This, begun over 2,000 years ago, has grown with the nation. All these codes, of which copies can be purchased at low cost, were frequently added to or modified in detail by Imperial edicts; and these additions were published for general information at stated intervals. "But," as Mr. Meadows says (*China and her Rebellions*, p. 23), "the Emperor's statute legislation must be faithfully deduced from general principles well known to the

country, and he and his ministers must, moreover, watch constantly that the existing law is administered with justice and impartiality. These have always been imperative conditions of the stability and prolonged duration of dynasties in China. Failure, whether wilful or the consequence of a pressure of unavoidable circumstances, entails inevitably, first contempt and apathy, then positive disaffection, then disorders, riots, gang robberies, insurrections against local authorities, and ultimately avowed rebellion aiming at a change of dynasty. If this is successful, then that fact is a palpable, and in China unquestioned, proof that the Divine Commission had been withdrawn from the old dynasty, and that the rebellion was not simply excusable, nor laudable only, but, as an execution of the will of Heaven, inevitable. The normal Chinese government is essentially based on moral force."

The fall of the late Manchu dynasty is due more than to any other cause to its departure from the established system of selecting office-holders. From the first, Manchus were appointed by nomination, not by examination; and with the increase of the race in numbers, the necessity for providing for its members grew, though in moral qualities they were not superior, and in intellectual acquirements were markedly inferior to their Chinese colleagues and subordinates. This induced a general laxity, hence spread of corruption, which brought on financial difficulties. To meet these the sale of government posts was introduced, and to incompetent Manchus were added incompetent Chinese, whose one aim was to extort from the people not only what they had paid for their posts but the means to secure others yet more lucrative. The consequences were more general corruption, further riots and insurrections, and increased expenditure and tyranny; until, wars with foreign Powers and the heavy indemnities successively imposed by the latter having produced financial chaos,

rebellion of a still more formidable character broke out, and the dynasty, recognizing that the Divine Commission had been withdrawn from it, abdicated.

*Pencil Speakings from Peking* is, in many respects, a remarkable book. It is the outcome of extensive reading and much thought. It is inspired by a more than ordinary sympathy with Chinese characteristics and a deep admiration for Chinese philosophy, the sections devoted to the latter being perhaps the most interesting in the book. Yet, when it is borne in mind that the number of Chinese who can read even a paraphrase in modern Chinese of the teachings of Confucius and Laotsze represents but a small percentage of the population of China, and that those who can read the archaic language in which those teachings were originally expressed constitute a yet smaller percentage, the conclusion must be reached that the influence ascribed to these teachings by our author is exaggerated, and that no new evidence has been adduced sufficiently strong to invalidate the conclusions of older sinologues.

It is matter for regret that neither are the names given of the translators from whose works the copious quotations from the sayings and writings of Confucius and of Laotsze have been taken, nor such references supplied as would enable the original text of those quotations to be consulted. For in these quotations such words as "righteousness" and "benevolence" are constantly met with; and until the exact signification to the Chinese of the characters so translated has been determined, and it has been established that they convey to them precisely the meaning which these words convey to us, it is useless to attempt to define the character and extent of the influence these writings exert in China. Thus, the character 義 has been frequently translated "righteousness" and the character 仁 "benevolence", but to the Chinese those characters convey a meaning quite different. To them the former means

“the duty a man owes to the State”, and the latter “the duty he owes to his fellow-man”.

A. E. H.

---

THE ŪRMURĪ OR BARGISTĀ LANGUAGES, AN ACCOUNT OF A LITTLE-KNOWN ERANIAN DIALECT. By Sir GEORGE ABRAHAM GRIERSON, K.C.I.E., Ph.D., D.Litt. Memoirs of the Asiatic Society of Bengal, vol. vii, No. 1.

In the year 1880 I first learnt from my instructor in Paštō, Ghulām Muḥammad Khān, of the existence of the Bargastā language. (I write the name Bargastā and not Bargistā, as that is how I remember to have heard it pronounced by Ghulām Muḥammad Khān and others, although he writes it with the vowel point denoting *i* in the second syllable. Probably it should really be Barg<sup>a</sup>stā, the vowel being the obscure sound which he calls the fathā-ī-Afghānī.) I hoped to be able to acquire some knowledge of the spoken language of Kāniguram, but I left that part of the N.W. Frontier before I had an opportunity of doing so. Ghulām Muḥammad Khān gave me a copy of his grammar of the language, and this has remained till the present day the only accessible authority on the subject. Sir George Grierson has now added to his labours on the Eranian dialects of the Indian marches an exhaustive monograph on this obscure language, and has established its claim to belong, not only to the Eranian family of languages, but more distinctly to the Western group of dialects such as Kurdish and those spoken in Western and Central Persia, rather than to the Eastern group, which comprises its nearer neighbours Paštō, Balōči, and the Pāmīr dialects. And in a wider classification it belongs to the non-Persian languages, under which name both these Western and Eastern groups are included, that is those

most nearly related to the Avesta, and not to the modern Persian, which traces its origin to the language of the Achæmenian inscriptions. This conclusion is supported by a full analysis of the sounds of the language under the head *Phonetics* (pp. 1-25). Although there are a few exceptions, such as are found in all the languages or dialects of this class, there can be no doubt that Sir George Grierson is fully justified in his views. Most of the changes in vowels or consonants find a parallel in one or other of the related dialects. Among those peculiar to Ōrmurī it will suffice to mention that of an original *v* to *j* before *i*, as in *jīstū*, twenty, while before *a*, *i*, *ā* it becomes *γ*, as in *γw-ēk* (aorist sg. 2. *γwas*), to speak (Av. *√vac*). With the latter the Balōcī *gwaš-ay* is compared by Sir G. Grierson. Perhaps in this case it would be more correct to say that the original *v* is represented by *γw* than simply by *γ*. Other points of originality which may be noticed are (1) the use of *a-*, prefixed to any common noun, as a definite article; (2) the formation of the plural in nouns by the termination *-i*, and (3) the formation of the past participle (as well as the infinitive) by such terminations as *ēk*, *ōk* (or *γōk*), and *ak*.

One remarkable survival from the old Medic language is found in the word *sruk*, a dog, which preserves almost unaltered the *σπάκα* which Herodotus tells us was the Medic for "dog".

Loan-words are numerous, and as might be expected from the position of Kāniguram in the midst of a Paštō-speaking population, most of its borrowings are from that language in the form spoken by the Wazīrīs, which it may be noted is, in nearly all its peculiarities, identical with that spoken in the Bannū district among the Bannūcī population, although it does not extend to Marwat in the same district, where what Sir G. Grierson calls standard south-western Paštō is spoken. Borrowings



from Persian either directly or through the medium of Paštō are common, as in other languages similarly placed.

The resemblance of Ō. *sir*, good, to Bal. *šurr*, good, is remarkable, but can hardly be due to direct borrowing considering the absolute absence of all communication between speakers of the two languages.

Students of Eranian language will look forward to the appearance of the volume of the Linguistic Survey in which the full grammar and vocabulary of Ōrmurī will appear, and meanwhile will be grateful to Sir George Grierson for this interesting summary of all that is most important in the language.

M. LONGWORTH DAMES.

THE PSYCHOLOGY OF MUSIC. By H. P. KRISHNA RAO,  
B.A. Mysore, 1916.

In this work Mr. Krishna Rao publishes a lecture on musical science which he delivered at the All-India Music Conference at Baroda in 1916. His theories appear to have excited much interest in Indian musical circles. How far it will be possible for Europeans trained in an entirely different system to appreciate his argument it is not easy to say; only an expert in musical science would be qualified to pronounce an opinion on the ideas which underlie his theory of the psychology of musical notes. According to him every note represents in itself a distinct sensation and calls forth a distinct emotion, and these emotions are of a simple and invariable character; music, he says, "can give expression only to one kind of feeling, i.e. tenderness, growing from an agreeable state to the disagreeable, and thence to pain by gradual degrees." Indian music alone adheres to this "natural" system, Western music "hopelessly mixes up the emotions". Yet he does not appear

unconscious of the many advantages and attractions of modern music, but advocates the development of Indian music on national lines, in which aspiration we may well join whether we agree with his theories or not.

M. L. D.

---

TRÆK AF INDIENS KULTUR. By A. YUSUF ALI.  
Translated by DAVID GRÜNBAUM. 66 pp. Copenhagen: V. Pios Boghandel. 1918.

This little book contains a Danish translation of three lectures delivered at Copenhagen in the spring of 1918, preceded by a portrait and brief biographical notice of the author and a short preface. The lectures are concerned with modern Indian poetry, the religious spirit in India, and the women of India, respectively. In his treatment of these topics Mr. Yusuf Ali insists throughout on the importance of the modern spirit in Indian life. In poetry there is, it is true, an archaizing school which looks solely towards the legendary past, but there is also a growing modern tendency, no longer confined to the servile imitation of foreign models, but racy of the soil, drawing its inspiration from the present and looking hopefully towards the future. So too in religion, under the old dogmatic and ritual forms, new ideas, largely influenced by the West but rooted also in the spiritual and devotional conceptions of the Indian faiths (such as *bhakti* and *karma*), are profoundly modifying the outlook of great sections of the people. The third lecture, which is slighter than the others, draws attention to the fact that the ideals of Indian womanhood are not necessarily incompatible in practice with modern tendencies. While in India there is no likelihood of the sex as a whole entering into the kind of open competition with men which now seems imminent in the West, yet in individual cases, few no doubt but important and

symptomatic, Indian women have shown considerable aptitude for administrative, literary, and other public work. It must be added that the author's attitude is conspicuously fair, both as between different sections of his own people and in giving due weight to the beneficial influences which they have derived from Europe and in particular from Great Britain. Without these, modern India could hardly have come into existence at all.

One gets from these lectures the impression that the India of to-day deserves more special study at the hands of Western scholars (as distinct from politicians, administrators, etc.) than it has hitherto received. As was only natural, the glories of the past have fascinated them and they have paid less attention to the development that was going on before their eyes. The Sanskrit and Pali classics have engrossed their studies, while the new and vigorous vernacular literatures have met with somewhat scant recognition. In other words, the outlook of Western scholarship has been somewhat too largely archæological. Even so, there is much to be said in its defence; the present has its roots deep in the past and can be thoroughly understood only by those who go back to the classics and the ancient records; and in these fields of research much work still remains to be done. But the present, which bears within it the germs of the future, is also in itself a worthy object of study.

That seems to be the author's moral. On the face of it, there appears to be much reason for his contention, and no doubt his plea will meet with a ready response at the hands of those whom it more directly concerns. As regards our own Society, it has always been its greatest pride that its sphere is catholic: it takes all Asiatic studies, ancient and modern, for its province. If it has hitherto tended in some measure to subordinate the latter to the former, it may fairly plead that in doing so it merely followed chronological and logical order, while

reserving full liberty hereafter to focus its attention more directly on to the modern side. That would be a normal process in its evolution which would fairly meet and satisfy the aspirations of all the contending schools. In publishing these lectures, which have had such a notable success in Scandinavia and which should also appear in English (the language in which they were delivered) for the benefit of our own reading public, Mr. Yusuf Ali has given an impulse to a movement which, it is to be hoped, will not be allowed to die away, but will open up new and interesting fields of research.

C. O. BLAGDEN.

---

CONTES PERSANS EN LANGUE POPULAIRE. By ARTHUR CHRISTENSEN. 130 pp. Kobenhavn, 1918.

The author of this little book has placed under indebtedness the Persian scholar as well as the folklorist. He has gathered up from the mouth of his teacher a number of *contes*, a somewhat inadequate title for this collection of popular jests. There is no fairy in them and scarcely any parallel to such tales. The teacher, a roving Hodja, of the type of Hadji Baba, told these stories in the language of the people, and Mr. Christensen took them down as faithfully as possible. They belong to the class of the popular Oriental jest-books of Nasreddin and Guifa, and a good many of them are of the type of the Indian fool and of the Western Lallenbuerger; or, coming nearer home, to "the wise men of Gotham", and not a few of the disingenuous jokes of Till, Eulenspiegel, and the Italian Bertoldo.

In a brief introduction the author discusses the philological peculiarities of the Persian popular language as represented by these texts, and he rightly refers to the scant material hitherto published in popular Persian. It is remarkable how little difference there is between the written and the spoken language. It is scarcely

perceptible ; no real dialectic differences in pronunciation, grammar, and lexicon seem to exist between the one and the other, save for some peculiarities which I believe can be found in much older Persian texts of a popular character ; it would have been interesting if the author's attention had been drawn to a vast number of Persian texts, some very old, others comparatively modern written with Hebrew characters. I refer to Tawwus' ancient translation of the Pentateuch, some old Persian commentaries among the MSS. of the British Museum, and a large number of books published in Jerusalem by the colony of Persian Jews from Bochara who had settled there, among them some Biblical epics in the style of the Shahnameh, also the story of Yussuf and Zuleika in similar metre, and a large number of other books, all of a popular character. Except the late Professor Bacher I am not aware that anyone has studied these texts from a philological point of view or has shown their dialectic peculiarities and their popular character. The last-named scholar has also published a Hebrew-Persian glossary to some of the books of the Bible, from a MS. of the fifteenth century in my possession exhibiting the same peculiarities. Yet in spite of this every student of Persian will feel greatly indebted to Mr. Christensen for this timely and valuable publication. No less important is this contribution to the student of folklore. The author, in his Introduction, discusses learnedly the origin of these jests, and in spite of Bedier he holds fast to the theory of borrowing and migration, which is now afresh gaining ground among the students of comparative popular literature. Mr. Christensen shows himself well acquainted with that literature, and to each story (their number being fifty-three) he adds references to parallel stories east and west. The book is beautifully printed and is one of the publications of the Danish Academy.

M. GASTER.

THE OCEAN IN THE LITERATURE OF THE WESTERN SEMITES. By A. J. WENSINCK. Amsterdam: Johannes Müller. 1918.

The author of this small volume of 66 pages is a Dutch scholar, who in his first contribution to learning has clearly established his reputation as one thoroughly versed in West Semitic literature. He has read widely in Rabbinic, Syriac, Arabic, and Ethiopic legendary works, and utilizes the Hebrew legends of the Old Testament for his purpose. The subject of his thesis consists in collecting and analysing the traditional beliefs concerning the ocean among the Western Semites. He naturally begins with a study of Hebrew cosmological ideas regarding the ocean, and then invades the dreary tales and fancies of the later Rabbinic writings, almost equalled in endless fanciful tales by the Syriac Christian and Moslem writers.

He recognizes that Hebrew views about the ocean (Tehom) are largely derived from Babylonia, that both peoples regarded the ocean as hostile to the divine powers of creation and order, and that both peoples held water to be an uncreated primeval element, a view in which Moslem theology concurs. These are the main ideas which hold together the widely gathered Semitic speculations set forth in the first chapter, "The Ocean in Cosmogony."

Chapter ii discusses cosmographic ideas concerning the ocean. The author first illustrates from Hebrew, Rabbinic, Syriac, and Arabic writings the well-known Semitic views of the subterranean ocean and the heavenly ocean. Then the theory, not accepted by all West Semitic peoples, of the world-encircling ocean is described according to the sources. Wensinck believes that the Hebrews had this idea, basing his assertion upon the expression "The ends of the earth". The Hebrew for this term is *aphesē 'āres*, and the author

following Hommel and Gunkel, believes that *éphes*, "end," is a loan-word in Hebrew from the Babylonian *apsu*, "sea," hence literally "seas of the earth". The Assyriologists will most emphatically reject this etymology, for *apsu* is the underworld sea of fresh water in Sumerian cosmography. In fact, the author does not understand Sumero-Babylonian ideas on this subject. On p. 60 he makes the erroneous statement that Ea, water-god of Eridu, is the god of Tehom (Babylonian *tiamat*). Undoubtedly the author has here the correct conception of Tehom as the element of Ea, who is the god of the nether sea of fresh water only. That is clearly what he means by Tehom in his discussion of the fresh-water sea in the final pages of the volume, but the unqualified statement that Ea was the god of Tehom should have been made with an explanation of the sense in which the word is there employed.

The author makes much of the Semitic theory that all things were created from water (pp. 7 and 56 *et passim*), a distinctly Sumero-Babylonian idea which seems to have been borrowed by the Ionic school of philosophy.<sup>1</sup> At the end of the volume is a long discussion of the legends of the fountain of life, found chiefly in the mythological poems and romances concerning Alexander the Great. The tradition in Syriac and Moslem literature located the fabulous fountain of life in the far West, the land of darkness. Other tales from Arabic writers are noted concerning the islands of paradise in the untraversed ocean. Throughout the volume original Arabic, Syriac, and Rabbinic passages are cited in the footnotes, and for most Semitic scholars these citations will satisfy their philological interest.

S. LANGDON.

<sup>1</sup> See the Journal of this Society, 1918, p. 434.

MISCELLANEOUS COPTIC TEXTS IN THE DIALECT OF  
UPPER EGYPT. Edited with English Translations.  
By E. A. WALLIS BUDGE. British Museum, 1915.

While there appears never to have been more than one source—the Nitrian monasteries—whence Bohairic MSS. of early date have reached us, the principal Saïdic finds have been made at three widely distant points: the earliest at the White Monastery, near Achmîm, whence by slow degrees came the main European collections of last century; the two later, after a long interval, almost simultaneously, in the Fayyûm and at Edfû. Of these two the former passed, for the most part, to Mr. Pierpont Morgan, while the latter (or the larger part of it) was acquired by the British Museum. It is from this additional stock that the materials for Dr. Budge's volumes (*Coptic Apocrypha*, *Coptic Martyrdoms*, and that under review) have been drawn.

The periods to which these three groups of MSS. belong may be roughly put as the ninth–twelfth, ninth–tenth, and tenth–eleventh centuries respectively. Is it purely a coincidence that these dates, together with that of the Bohairic MSS. above referred to (tenth century), should be relatively so near together? An explanation is scarcely to be found in the material whereon the texts are written: with very rare exceptions on paper, all these MSS. are of parchment. But by the ninth century the use of parchment as the usual book material was well assured; papyrus was no longer its rival, and paper, before the eleventh century at least, was not familiar. Our Saïdic MSS. must in fact be regarded as representing the age when good, though no longer the finest, parchment was most easily obtainable.

Clearly at the close of the tenth century there was a busy school of caligraphists at Esne, for among the MSS. edited in Dr. Budge's volumes a dozen bear the names of scribes resident there. Their pens were largely



employed by pious benefactors of the churches and monasteries of Edfû, thirty miles farther south. Among these were the shrines of St. Michael and of St. Mercurius, and this explains the prominence among these texts of legends relating to those two saints. Of the three concerned with Michael, one (the History of Dorotheus and Theopiste) seems to have been among the most popular stories of that age<sup>1</sup>: not only have we, in the present volume, two MSS. of a Sa'idic version, but remnants of two, perhaps of three; other MSS. of this version are extant (Brit. Mus. Nos. 161, 304, 405; Paris 131<sup>1</sup>, 1; Zoega clv); while, besides the Bohairic version previously edited by Dr. Budge (*St. Michael*, pp. 1 ff.), there exists another, distinct and still unpublished, in the Vatican (*Cod. lxiii*).<sup>2</sup>

The texts relating to Mercurius, the martyr so prominently honoured throughout Egypt,<sup>3</sup> include one (pp. 231 ff.), whereof the Greek original has but recently been edited (Delehayé, *Saints Militaires*, 234 ff.). With the exception of the remarkable version of the *Apocalypse of Paul*, this is the only text in the volume of which a Greek prototype has so far been recognized.

Another of these MSS. was owned by a third church at Edfu, whose patron, the saintly Aaron, bishop of Philæ, does not figure in the calendar. Its principal text (printed on pp. 432–502) is of uncommon interest, giving

<sup>1</sup> Mr. Gaselee has included an English rendering in his recent *Stories from the Christian East* (London, 1918).

<sup>2</sup> That this story is of Greek (Alexandrine) and not of Coptic origin, is made the more probable by the designation of Dorotheus' residence: the published Bohairic version calls it "the town of Senahôr" (followed of course by the Arabic, BM. Or. 3598, 4a, Shanhûr), but the Sa'idic has simply "in our *συνοπία*", i.e. presumably in the neighbourhood of Alexandria, whose Patriarch the supposed narrator is.

<sup>3</sup> An interesting account of the acquisition in A.D. 1488, through the agency of an Armenian trader, of one of the martyr's bones, for his church in Cairo, is to be read in the *Synaxarium* (ed. Forget), on the 9th of Baûnah.

as it does a quantity of new material for the history of early Christianity in the most distant of Egyptian provinces. It may be noted incidentally that the see of Philæ appears, from notes in two MSS. (*Copt. Apocr.*, pl. lviii; *Misc. Copt. Texts*, pl. xxii), to be combined, about the 11th century, with those of Thebes (*Καστρων* or *Θηβων*) and Edfû—a fact not, it seems, recorded elsewhere.<sup>1</sup>

Innumerable features of interest might indeed be pointed out in the rich material offered us by Dr. Budge even in this one volume. We must be grateful to him and to the Trustees of the Museum for making such a quantity of new texts available, without demanding of so indefatigable an editor a commentary besides.

W. E. CRUM.

---

THE PRIVATE DIARY OF ANANDA RANGA PILLAI. Vol. VI: October, 1748, to March, 1750. Edited by H. DODWELL, M.A., Curator, Madras Record Office. Printed by the Superintendent, Government Press. 1918. Price 3 rupees 12 annas (5s. 6d.).

The latest volume of this diary has the initial advantage of presenting matter hitherto unpublished. It deals also with a period of great historical interest. The year 1748 is an epoch in Indian history when thrones, Mahommedan and Hindu, were changing hands; and in Europe the Peace of Aix-la-Chapelle was being signed on the very day when the present instalment of the diary opens. By this treaty the town of Madras was restored to England, while Louisberg and Cape Breton in North America were handed back to France, an exchange which Dupleix himself had suggested to his Directors in Paris when reporting the capture of Madras

<sup>1</sup> The Catalogue of Ses (Amélineau, *Géogr.* 573) gives all the three distinct. Their union might, of course, be but temporary.

two years previously. The war between England and France was over, but in India the two rival Companies, with their headquarters only 12 miles apart, at Fort St. David and Pondicherry, were actually at the commencement of their final struggle for supremacy. Mr. Dodwell dates the historical importance of Pondicherry and Madras from the battle of Ambur in August, 1749. It would perhaps be better to take the Peace of Aix-la-Chapelle as the starting-point.

Mr. Dodwell gives a very clear picture of the main events upon which the diary touches, and a map is included to illustrate the Ambur campaign. It is urged that the current version of the story is wrong. "According to the news which reached Ranga Pillai," says the introduction, "Chanda Sahib did not enter the Carnatic from the north, but from the west, by what was called the Chengama Pass." It is true that all through the diary the Chengama passes are spoken of, and even Nasir Jang is represented as arriving by this route. The two messengers from Nasir Jang are cross-examined as to their statement that he has reached the passes, and say that they themselves have been four days on the road and Nasir Jang would be there by now. This direct evidence is better than some of the bazaar rumours on which Ranga Pillai's deductions are often based, but the main objection to Mr. Dodwell's theory is that the so-called Chengama Pass merely leads from what is now the plain country of the Salem District to the plains of South Arcot. The real passes from the Deccan plateau are north of the Palar River. Chengama lies to the south of the Javadi Hills, a detached block of mountainous country separated from "the wide stony wold of the Deccan" by the valley of the Palar. Mr. Dodwell's map, by the way, shows "a carriage road" from Vellore across the Javadis to Tirupattur. No such road exists or can exist. Orme's maps show the Javadi block very clearly,

and there is no track marked. At the present day there is certainly no road.

The exact route by which all the invasions from the north entered the Carnatic is open to doubt, but it is probable that the Mahrattas, Chanda Sahib, and Nasir Jang all came along a beaten track. Dost Ali in 1740, according to Wilks, met the Mahrattas and was killed in the Damalcheruvu Pass, but Anwar-ud-din fought and died at Ambur. Nasir Jang may have marched down the Ambur Pass also, though his rendezvous was at Gingee. It would be quite practicable for a force to march from Damalcheruvu across the Palmaner plateau and descend by Ambur, and in one of Orme's maps such a route is indicated. The best evidence of Chanda Sahib's movements is contained in a letter from d'Auteuil which Dupleix received on July 26, 1749, a week before the battle of Ambur. d'Auteuil was on his way to join the invaders, and, writing from Arcot, places them eighteen hours journey *northwards*, while the Nawab is said to be about the same distance towards the south. At the battle d'Auteuil and his men did most of the fighting, and it must be presumed that he met Chanda Sahib somewhere *north* of Arcot. Ranga Pillai's information was mostly hearsay, while his own knowledge of geography was limited. Dupleix and Ranga Pillai examine a map of India from the Kistna to Cape Comorin, and the French Governor remarks that many places are omitted and others wrongly entered. Their surmises as to the movements of the forces are interesting but of no great value. Orme was himself in Bengal until 1752, after which he came to Madras as a Member of Council, and his information was gathered at first hand. The evidence of d'Auteuil confirms the accuracy of Orme's story.

The chief interest of the diary lies in the many sidelights thrown upon the activities of Dupleix. Seeing the Governor almost daily, he was practically the keeper of

his master's conscience. Even the rapacious Madame Dupleix does not oust him from his position, though he laments her influence. "The Governor," he says, "lacks foresight, does all his wife tells him, relates to her all news, and acts on her advice." The legendary Dupleix, always dreaming of a French Empire in India, has vanished under the careful scrutiny of M. Cultru in his *Dupleix, ses plans politiques, sa disgrâce* and of Colonel Biddulph's excellent monograph. Colonel Biddulph asserts that Dupleix did not create opportunities, but seized them as they presented themselves, and in the pages of the diary the faithful Boswell shows how such opportunities were utilized. One clear purpose directing Dupleix's action was to supplant the English Company, but, as Mr. Dodwell points out, he was ruined by his own optimism. On July 19, 1749, he tells Ranga Pillai that "as soon as Chanda Sahib arrives the English power in these parts will come to an end". He could not foresee that men like Clive and Lawrence were even then preparing to turn the scale against him, and his vanity, which Ranga Pillai fanned in true Oriental style, increased as the tide of events appeared to be setting in his favour.

In March, 1750, however, when the diary closes, the situation is most critical. Nasir Jang with an army of 300,000, supported by Major Lawrence and Mr. Cope with English troops drawn from Fort St. David and from Trichinopoly, is in a huge camp only 15 miles from Pondicherry, and for some days past has been face to face with the armies of Chanda Sahib and d'Auteuil. Shots have been exchanged, and a battle appears to be imminent. Dupleix sits at Pondicherry and sends money and advice to Chanda Sahib, saying, "Be bold and send me happy news of your victory." According to Colonel Biddulph, Dupleix's letters tell a different tale and show that he was quite prepared to abandon Chanda Sahib, if terms could

be made with Nasir Jang, but Ranga Pillai's diary contains no trace of such treachery. Dupleix assures Chanda Sahib and Muzaffir Jang that they are "as three heads under one hat" and must stand or fall together. News comes that Nasir Jang has himself made overtures of peace to his nephew Muzaffir Jang, and it is clear that Dupleix is desperately anxious to secure a settlement without fighting. "I said all I could," writes Ranga Pillai, "to convince him that peace would be made, but he put no trust in my words. I did my best to encourage him, and he argued that I was right, but afterwards asked me ten score of times if it was really so." Could any picture give a more vivid representation of the scene? Dupleix must have known that his French officers were discontented, that the presence of English troops would give confidence to Nasir Jang's enormous army, and that the result of any battle would probably be unfavourable. This accounts for his extreme nervousness, and he eagerly swallows a rumour to the effect that Mr. Cope has returned to Fort St. David.

This act of the drama terminates badly for Dupleix. The French officers mutiny and Chanda Sahib is defeated, but within a few months the whole situation changes. Bussy makes a brilliant coup by the capture of Gingee Fort, Nasir Jang is killed, and Muzaffir Jang and Chanda Sahib come again under the victorious hat of Dupleix. The next volume of Ranga Pillai's diary will therefore unfold a very interesting tale. The present volume leaves us on the eve of these happenings, but has carried the story through many exciting chapters. It is unfortunate that the first gaps in a diary begun in 1736 should occur at a period of such importance. The month of the Ambur battle is one of these blanks, and the name Ambur is not mentioned in the diary. But the volume now presented is undoubtedly more interesting and more important than its predecessors, and the issue of further

volumes will be eagerly awaited by students of this period. It might be advisable in future to indicate whether the translation is from the original or from the copies made by M. Montbrun.

R. C. CULLING CARR.

---

FROM THE GARDEN OF EDEN TO THE CROSSING OF THE JORDAN. By Sir WILLIAM WILLCOCKS, K.C.M.G. Cairo: the French Institute of Oriental Archæology. 1918.

This is a small but most important book of ninety-three pages, full of really suggestive material derived from the inscriptions of Babylonia and Assyria, and from personal experience gained in these countries and in Egypt. The preface is by Professor Sayce, and is preceded by an explanatory note by the author, from which we learn that the five chapters of which the work consists were originally given as lectures before the Egyptian Institute and the Sultanieh Geographical Society of Cairo in 1913 and 1917. For thirty-four years, the author says, he has been studying on the spot everything in the Bible which has to do with irrigation and irrigated countries, and this book is the result. This new method of introducing a friendly scholar's preface offers a refreshing variation in the way of introductions to learned works.

A preface from the pen of Professor Sayce is always, it is needless to say, an interesting thing. In the present work he points out that the meaning of the Heb. *ed*, translated "mist" in the English Bible, would be better rendered by "flood", as in Sir W. Willcocks's book. The Garden of Eden was therefore not watered by a mist which arose from the earth, but by a flood which overflowed the land.

With regard to the plagues of Egypt, Professor Sayce

finds Sir W. Willcocks's explanation of them most convincing. These plagues have not only happened, but they are actually happening every day, or would happen in a like combination of circumstances—external troubles and a low Nile. How the land of Goshen, where the Israelites dwelt, escaped, could only be indicated by an engineer who had made the irrigation of Egypt practically his own. Professor Sayce also finds illuminating explanations of the route of the Hebrews when going forth from Egypt.

It is naturally interesting to find in Akkadian (Semitic Babylonian) a word resembling the *ēd* of Gen. ii, 6 and Job xxxvi, 27, but is this comparison correct? *Ēdû* (for such is the Akkadian form) is probably derived from the Sumerian *a-dē*, "flowing water," and the long vowel with which the word ends would naturally be expected in the Hebrew form. The Biblical *ēd*, however, may be a synonym without being a derivative.

Interesting are Sir William's description of the course of the Tigris, Euphrates, Kurun, and Kerkha, and the importance of the question of fresh or salt water in deciding whether the "Deep" was a fresh or a salt water stretch of the Persian Gulf:—

"The Tigris enters its delta at Beled, south of Samarra, over the ruins of one of the most interesting works of antiquity. In ancient days some giant, local tradition says Nimrod, closed the channel of the Tigris by an earthen dam and turned the river over the hard conglomerate, forcing it to flow at a high level and irrigate the whole country. Coursing down over rapids, the Tigris became navigable at Opis; and from there past the modern Bagdad and on to Kut el Amara it kept within the channel of to-day. From Kut on to Ur of the Chaldees, past Lagash, the Tel Lo of to-day, the ancient Tigris followed the line of the modern Hai or Garraf branch. The country past Amara and Gurna



on the modern Tigris was an immense sheet of fresh water known as the Susiana lake. The levels of the country prove this beyond the question of a doubt, as does also the difference of the section of the river below and above Kut."

Nowwithstanding that the Karun and the Kerkha, flowing from the east, prevented the salt water of the Persian Gulf, as the author says, from entering the marshes, there were salt lands in Babylonia or the adjoining tracts, as is shown by expressions in the early land-contracts and the fish-tablets of Lagash, which seem to refer to the salt-water fishermen (see the *Amherst Tablets*, vol. i, p. 5, description of tablet No. 32). Sir W. Willcocks refers to the native tradition that an embankment to keep out the salt water had been built by Nimrod, and as is well known, that hero is none other than the native Babylonian Merodach. This tradition is confirmed by the statement of the bilingual account of the Creation (J.R.A.S., 1891, p. 395, line 31), which states that the god made a bank on the sea-shore.

Naturally, we require to know more about the history of Babylonia in prehistoric times than we do now. It is an accepted explanation, and no mere theory, that the Persian Gulf anciently extended much farther inland than it does to-day. If we accept this, it follows that the inland towns and cities of Babylonia may have been much older than those nearer the head of the gulf. Whether this would mean that Babylon, as a foundation, was older than Êridu, the Paradise-city, or not, may be regarded as a moot point, but its greater antiquity is at least possible. This, it is to be noted, would account for the identification of the whole of Babylonia with the earthly Paradise, as suggested in Genesis and stated by the scribes of Babylonia (see the P.S.B.A., May, 1913, pp. 154, 155). But the two sites of Eden—that of the Bible and of the Babylonians—were not, according to

Sir William, identical; that of the Hebrews was west of Assyria, whilst the Êridu of the Babylonians was situated much farther south—at the head of the Persian Gulf. The rivers of the Hebrew Eden differed somewhat from what we are accustomed to think they were, the Pison being a canal running through the large lake by Kerbela and ending, to the south, at Kufa, and the Gihon being the continuation of the same waterway, which entered the Persian Gulf on the west of Êridu. The Hiddekel Sir William identifies with a connecting canal which, leaving the Euphrates just above Ramadi, entered the Tigris south of Bagdad. As I have pointed out in the *Expository Times*,<sup>1</sup> the river-system in the Babylonian Paradise differed radically from that of the Hebrews, as the four rivers of their Paradise were to be identified with four of their canals, and the Tigris (*Hiddekel*<sup>2</sup>) and the Euphrates (*Perath*<sup>3</sup>) apparently did not form part of it. Some adjustment of the grouping of the canals in the Babylonian Paradise-tract is necessary, and may also be needful in that of the Hebrew account, but Sir W. Willcocks has certainly hit the right explanation in the main.

There is much more in the monograph, but enough has probably been said about it to give a good idea of its importance. For the rest, it may be said that though it contains only 93 pages, 9 $\frac{1}{4}$  by 6 $\frac{3}{8}$  inches, it has 228 paragraphs. It not only treats of Babylonia and its Paradise-sites, but also of the Tablets of the Creation and the Flood; the years of famine in Joseph's time; the ten plagues and the passage of the Red Sea; and "Through the wilderness and the crossing of the Jordan". Sketch-maps show "The Garden of Eden and the Four Rivers of Genesis"; the geography of the land from

<sup>1</sup> Jan. 1918, pp. 182-3; March, 1918, p. 288.

<sup>2</sup> Assy. (*H*)idiklat, from the Sum. (*H*)idigna.

<sup>3</sup> Assy. *Purattu*, probably pronounced *Puraththu*.

"Egypt to Babylon"; "Lake Moeris"; and the country of "The Wanderings" of the Israelites when they came forth from Egypt. Unfortunately there are no indices, but their place is partly supplied in pp. 1-12, and at other points by marginal references to Biblical passages, etc. Nevertheless, indices would have added greatly to the value of the book.

Friedrich Delitzsch certainly did good work when he wrote his *Wo lag das Paradies* with its voluminous geographical appendix, but a greater than Delitzsch is here. It was an Englishman named Hopkins who first started the theory that the rivers of Paradise were Babylonian canals, and it has remained for an Englishman to complete this identification.

British Assyriologists at least will look forward to Sir William's learned conclusions being confirmed by the excavations which are now, it is to be hoped, in progress.


T. G. PINCHES.

---

BULLETIN DE L'ECOLE FRANÇAISE D'EXTREME ORIENT :  
Tome xviii, Nos. 2, 3, and 4. Hanoi, 1918.

Attention may be drawn to these excellent Bulletins. In No. 3 M. Henri Maspero deals with the History of Annam, and in No. 4 the late M. le Capitaine Silvestre—who was lost in the *Athos* on February 17, 1917—gives an excellent account of the White Thais of Phong-Tho. But especial attention should be directed to No. 3, *Les Femmes de Çakya-Muni*, by M. Noël Peri. The biographies of Buddha preserved in Chinese literature describe him as having had as many as three wives, and they add to their statements, which in themselves are credible, though not always in complete accord, a number of details which are stock episodes in folklore. Hence we are confronted with the following problems : (1) Does folklore arise out of historical occurrences, and

if so, similar incidents being recorded in respect of several personages, out of which of those several episodes did the stock folklore theme originate? Or (2) Did early chroniclers adorn their tales by adding to them stock folklore episodes, and, if so, were they content to take their *dramatis personæ* as they found them or had they to invent new characters to enable them to stage their scenes? These questions no doubt suggest a reply, but it is not intended to be a definite answer. For the present it will suffice to indicate some folklore episodes in M. Peri's excellent paper. Buddha's family consisted of—



In one version Rāhula is Buddha's natural son, and the only thing miraculous about his birth is the protracted gestation, which extends to six years, quite a moderate period in Indian folklore, and which is explained in certain Jātakas as a punishment for Yaçodharā's acts in a former birth or as a penalty inflicted on Rāhula himself, who was Brahmadaṭṭa in a previous incarnation. The discrepancies in these explanations of the prolongation of Rāhula's gestation signify their origin. The stock incident was doubtless first interpolated and then the Buddhist monks had to find explanations of it. As far as the present writer is aware, protracted gestation is in folklore a sign of supernatural origin, never a penalty.<sup>1</sup>

As a test of Rāhula's legitimacy, which is suspect, contrary to the usual theory of folklore, Yaçodharā places him on a stone and sets it afloat on a pool. As it does not sink, his legitimacy is established. This looks

<sup>1</sup> In one version of the Guga legends that hero *threatens* not to be born for twelve years if his mother disregards his behest. (Rose, *Glossary of Punjab Tribes and Castes*, i, p. 184.)

like an adaptation of the Romulus, Remus, Sargon, Moses, and other stories, in all of which the infant is placed upon the waters, but *not* as a test of legitimacy.

The history of the kingship is also illustrated by Devadatta's conduct. He wishes to be avenged of the obstacles which Buddha has put in his way and to succeed to the throne. But the Sākyaas tell him: "The Bodhisattva has left a queen; marry her and you shall be our king." Claudius in *Hamlet* succeeds by precisely the same right, but Yaçodharā is more faithful than Gertrude and punishes Devadatta for his advances. It looks as if the folklore theme were recast on a higher moral plane. But another incident is introduced which illustrates how the primitive king was chosen. In a former birth Buddha was a *rusé voleur* who secures his mate, a princess, by violence, and yet instead of being punished as he deserved he is given her to wife with a share in her father's kingdom. The *swayamvara* is also alluded to in the legend of Gautami and her choice of the prince Siddhārta, and in that of the kinglet Suprabuddha's daughter Gopi and her choice of him.

M. Peri may be right in his conclusion that the Buddha had three wives, and not one only as Dr. Rhys Davids held, but it is much more certain that the Buddhist biographers could not resist the temptation to engraft on their historical facts a good many commonplaces of folklore which they explained in their own way for the edification of their readers.

H. A. R.

#### REVUE D'ASSYRIOLOGIE, VOL. XIV

No. I continues the series of "Assyrian Grammatical Texts" by S. Langdon, being chiefly re-editions and new joins of tablets in the British Museum. This number contains the following tablets: K 4342, restored from

Rm. 609, 485, K 4558, and 80-11-12, 475, the whole forming two tablets of *ana itti-šu*. K 245 is collated and partly republished; a tablet of *ana itti-šu*. K 56+60 is collated and restored from Th. 1905-4-9, 1; it is also a tablet of *ana itti-šu*. Sm. 9 is published, K 260 is republished. J. Zalitzsky, "Deux Cachets Hétéens Inédits," published two important seals with Hittite inscriptions. Professor Scheil has discovered an Anzanite tablet of omens, the first document of the kind hitherto recovered in the ancient Elamitic language. The article, "Déchiffrement d'un Document Anzanite," is completed by a vocabulary of Anzanite words.

No. II begins with an article by Contenau, "Les Cylindres Syro-Hittites," a timely study of Hittite glyptic art. S. Langdon continues his "Assyrian Grammatical Texts"; K 152+4204 is edited as tablet II of the series *gar-gud*=*imrû*. K 2051 is republished with commentary. Professor Scheil continues his "Notules": No. 22, "Fragment de tablette médicale." No. 23, "La pierre *gišširgallum*," in which Scheil shows that the Sumerian stone *giš-sir-gal* is not *paruttu* in Semitic, and designates a calcareous stone, not a marble. Cassite inscription on a stone hatchet. No. 24, business document from Susa. No. 25, very early temple record written in pictographs. No. 26, study of the legal phrase *katam nasāhu*, "to withdraw the hand." M. Pillet, ancien attaché à la Délégation en Perse, writes his memories of the French expedition in Mesopotamia and Media, 1851-5.

No. III begins with an important article on a new medical tablet by Professor Scheil. The same scholar continues his series "Cylindres et Légendes Inédits" and his "Notules": No. 27, fragment of the Assyrian astrological work *enuma Anu* <sup>iii</sup> *Enlil*, a tablet found at Susa. Another tablet, probably from Sippar and duplicate of K 7629 of the same series, is given in No. 28. No. 29 contains two important Cassite tablets on liver omens.

No. 30, Sumerian contract of the reign of Enlilbani (11th king of Isin). No. 31, two temple records of the time of Abisârê (6th king of Larsa). No. 32, Sumerian contract of early period. Nos. 33-4, Neo-Babylonian contracts. No. 35, fragment of an inscription of Salmanasar. No. 36, fragment, duplicate of Nebuchadnezzar's Wadi Brissa inscription, also published by Unger in *Zeitschrift für Assyriologie*, xxix, 182. No. 37, a note in which the author defends the reading *Anușaltum* for *Anunitum*.

No. IV begins with Scheil's articles on a new grammatical tablet, "Fragment du Vocabulaire *maliku* = *šurru*," and a new list of temples. Scheil continues his valuable "Notules". No. 39, new fragment, containing rituals at the restoration of buildings. No. 40, Sumerian contract concerning *šamšāti* (sun discs). No. 41, Sumerian tablet of Ur dynasty, in which Susa and Elam are distinguished. No. 42, two late contracts containing the word *tamirtu*, "pond." No. 43, Neo-Babylonian letter proving a word *inu*, "wine." P. Toscane contributes a study of the scorpion in archæology and religion, "Sur la Figuration et le Symbole du Scorpion."

S. LANGDON.

---

## OBITUARY NOTICES

---

### PROFESSOR ERNST WINDISCH

It is somewhat strange that the only honorary members whose loss this Society had to deplore in 1918 both represented exactly the same subjects, Sanskrit and Comparative Philology, that both were natives of the same country, and that both died at very nearly the same age.

Ernst Windisch was a native of Saxony, having been born at Dresden on September 4, 1844. Entering the University of Leipzig in 1863, he studied Classical, Germanic, Sanskrit, and Comparative Philology there till 1867, when he took his degree of Ph.D. In the following year he accepted a classical mastership at St. Thomas's High School (*Thomas-Gymnasium*), Leipzig, where in 1869 he was admitted as *Privatdocent* for Sanskrit and Comparative Philology in the University. The next two years he spent in London, cataloguing Sanskrit MSS. in the India Office Library and at the same time devoting himself to the study of Celtic languages. In 1871 he returned to Leipzig on being promoted to the status of extraordinary professor in the University at the age of 27. He had been there only a year when he migrated, on being offered an ordinary professorship, first to Heidelberg for a year and then to Strassburg for two years. Finally, in 1877, he went back to his original University, where he spent the remaining forty-one years of his industrious life.

Windisch's activity as a scholar was more diversified than is usual among German professors. It was mainly distributed among four subjects: Comparative Philology, Sanskrit, Pāli, and Celtic.

He began his career, however, with a classical and a Germanic subject in succession, his inaugural dissertation



for his doctor's degree dealing with the longer Homeric hymns (*de hymnis homericis majoribus*, 1867), which was followed by a treatise on the sources of the Old Saxon Gospel Harmony, *Der Heliand und seine Quellen* (1868). But he soon turned to directly comparative studies concerned mostly with Latin, Greek, Sanskrit, and especially Celtic etymology. About a dozen articles of this character from his pen appeared between 1869 and 1877. The most important of these is perhaps that on the verbal forms in Sanskrit, Avestic, Italic, and Celtic containing *r* (1887). He also wrote reviews, to the number of about sixteen, of works concerned with Comparative Philology (including Etruscan) and published in the years 1868-77.

Though Windisch, like Eggeling at Edinburgh, was Professor of Sanskrit as well as of Comparative Philology—subjects which since those days have become separated in most Universities—he published no work of an independent and original character in book-form on Sanskrit. But he collaborated with Professor Eggeling in compiling a part of the India Office Catalogue of Sanskrit Manuscripts, his share (1894) embracing the greater portion of the philosophical texts. He moreover brought out a selection of twelve Vedic hymns entitled *Zwölf Hymnen des Rigveda mit Sāyana's Commentar* (1883). This Reader was specially useful in introducing the German student to Sāyana's commentary, which was practically inaccessible to him, though Max Müller's first edition of the *Rgveda*, with Sāyana's commentary in six volumes, had been completed several years before. This manual also supplies, besides some other matter, a vocabulary to the extracts from Sāyana and an appendix containing a list of words in the interpretation of which European scholars and Sāyana differ. He further wrote about a dozen articles on Sanskrit subjects ranging over the period 1873-1909. Several of these are concerned

with the interpretation of Vedic passages, while others have a comparative character. That which has the most general interest is perhaps his paper, read at the Congress of Orientalists at Berlin in 1881, dealing with the question of Greek influence on the Indian drama.

Towards the end of the eighties Windisch began to extend his Indian studies to Pāli, to which his contributions are as substantial as those to Sanskrit itself. Thus he edited the text of the *Iti-Vuttaka* in 1889, while his *Māra und Buddha* (1895) and *Buddha's Geburt und die Lehre von der Seelenwanderung* (1908), are two substantial additions to the history of Buddhist religion based on Pāli texts. He also wrote some half-dozen articles concerning questions of Pāli philology. Among well over 150 reviews which he contributed to journals on books dealing with India, several were on Pāli and Buddhism, though the great majority handled Sanskrit subjects.

Not possessing the special knowledge necessary for the purpose, I have not touched upon Windisch's work on Celtic philology, which was very considerable, the bibliography of his contributions to this subject containing about fifty items. I leave the task of describing and appraising his achievements in this field to the competent hands of the writer of the article appended to this notice. Altogether Professor Windisch's writings, counting articles and reviews as well as books, amount to nearly 300 in number. But his literary activity went beyond this. Thus he contributed as collaborator to Delbrück's work on the use of the subjunctive and optative in Sanskrit and Greek (1871), and his name appears on the title-page of the first three volumes of the same scholar's *Syntaktische Forschungen*. He further edited the two volumes of the lesser writings of Georg Curtius (1886). He was also editor of twenty-three volumes (xxxiv to lvi) of the *Journal of the German Oriental Society*, and in association with the other officers of that Society published a survey

of its activities during half a century under the title of *Die Deutsche Morgenländische Gesellschaft, 1845-1895*.

Professor Windisch's work was not characteristically brilliant, but it was sound and careful, contributing much to the advancement of knowledge. It accordingly earned wide recognition among scholars and learned societies. He was an honorary member not only of this but of the American Oriental Society, and a corresponding member of the Institute of France, of the British Academy, of the Irish Academy, Dublin, and of the Royal Bavarian Academy of Sciences.

Finally, on the occasion of his 70th birthday, September 4, 1914, he was presented as a token of esteem with a *Festschrift*, a substantial volume which contains a collection of essays by 34 pupils and friends, and to which is prefixed a list of more than 100 names of scholars who by their signatures expressed their high appreciation of the value of his contributions to learning. This gift, I feel sure, caused him much pleasure; but war having broken out before it came into his hands, he was prevented from communicating with the British contributors. I am unable to say what he may have published since the beginning of August, 1914; but as I understand, he was in failing health before that time, I doubt whether he was able to produce much in the last four years of his life.

Taking his share in academic administrative work he was Rector of Leipzig University for the year 1895 to 1896.

He was married to the daughter of an eminent political economist, Wilhelm Roscher. One of his sons, Hans Windisch, has already distinguished himself as a Professor in the Faculty of Theology at Leiden.

I first made his acquaintance at Berlin in 1881 and met him at other congresses, but I came most into personal contact with him at Leipzig when I took my degree

there and he was my chief examiner, and twenty-five years later when as a delegate I attended in 1909 the quincenary of the University. On these occasions I saw a good deal of him and was several times at his house in the *Universitätsstrasse*. He was always very kind and considerate, taking much more trouble both in personal relations and in correspondence than one had any right to expect. He struck me as a man of much mental refinement. It was doubtless on this account that he expressed a great admiration for the English "gentleman", a type which he did not seem to regard as much developed in Germany. It was especially his humanity, I think, that must have attracted him to the study of Buddhism. Owing to the same quality he cannot have felt any sympathy with so ghastly an atrocity as the sinking of the *Lusitania*.

A. A. MACDONELL.

---

The death of Ernst Windisch, on October 30, 1918, took away the last representative of the older generation of Celtic scholars. Like his contemporaries, Stokes and Atkinson, he approached Irish from the point of view of Comparative Philology. And it was therefore natural that his interest should be drawn exclusively to the older stages of the language. It was on the texts of the heroic sagas that his chief work was done. During his stay in London in 1870-1 he made extensive transcripts from manuscripts. His intention was to make some contribution to the solution of the Ossianic question, which from the days of Herder and Goethe had exercised an irresistible fascination over the minds of German scholars. But it was with a right instinct that he went back to the older epic cycle, and set himself to print texts and compile vocabularies in illustration of that cycle. The first results of his work appeared in vol. i of the series *Irische Texte*, 1880. This

was a miscellaneous collection, which, though mainly devoted to texts of the older heroic cycle of Cuchulainn and Conchobar, contained also such poetical texts as the hymns from the Book of Hymns, the poems from the St. Paul MS., and a late Ossianic poem, as well as so excellent an example of the vision literature based on New Testament apocrypha as the Vision of Adamnan. The lexicon which accompanied these texts (wisely left untranslated) was the first attempt to deal on a large scale with the lexicographical material available for the study of Middle Irish texts. It still remains (with the addition of the glossary to the Táin by the same editor) the fullest collection for the study of the language of the heroic cycle, and as a general contribution to Irish lexicography it has by no means lost its value. Some of its defects were pointed out soon after its appearance by Heinrich Zimmer—with the omniscient air, acrid personal tone, and not infrequent blundering of that indubitably brilliant scholar—in his *Keltische Studien*. The passage of time and the more intensive study of Irish have revealed many more. But the very great service rendered by this book and the other publications of its author to these studies is beyond question. It is still the indispensable companion of every student of this subject, and, if it has to be used with caution, that is the necessary result of the advance of scholarship during the past generation.

The service rendered by this first volume of *Irishche Texte* was continued by the issue—in collaboration with Whitley Stokes—of four other volumes (in five parts) between 1884 and 1909. Windisch's contributions to the series were almost entirely devoted to the heroic cycle, and this side of his work was crowned in 1904 by the issue of the Book of Leinster version of the Táin Bó Cualgne, the central epic of the cycle, in a stately extra volume. This text with its introduction, translation,

commentary, and glossary is Windisch's chief contribution to the elucidation of the epic cycle on which he had been at work for more than thirty years. The volume is mainly valuable as an exhaustive collection of material. Windisch refrained from any attempt to solve the difficult literary and historical questions of the origin and growth of the saga, though many incidental remarks here and there contribute suggestions towards the solution of these problems. It is, indeed, as a sober and cautious collector of material that Windisch will be remembered in Celtic studies. He was not one of those brilliant innovators who leave the impress of their personality upon the studies of their predilection. The great discoveries—such as that of the law of the Irish accent, for instance—were not his. And he had not the fine literary tact of his collaborator, Whitley Stokes, or the acute and cool judgment of Rudolph Thurneysen. But his texts and collections of lexicographical and other illustrative material rendered an indispensable service to Irish studies, and there is no scholar of the present generation who is not under a deep obligation to him.

His Irish Grammar was rather a useful companion to early Middle Irish texts than a critical account of the language, and, as such, was valuable in its day. Of his other work his book *Das Keltische Britannien*, 1912, is a valuable survey of the material available for, and the current theories bearing upon, the study of the population, religion, and literature of the inhabitants of Britain until the coming of the Anglo-Saxons and the exploits of Arthur. Here, too, he does not so much break new ground as collect material towards the solution of the difficult problems that cluster round the antiquities of the Celtic peoples of the British Isles.

With Windisch passes a whole generation of Irish scholars. They were men like Stokes and Atkinson whose work was to make accessible for students

the mass of material in manuscript. In this respect they carried on the work of O'Curry and O'Donovan, though the publication of Zeuss's *Grammatica Celtica* enabled them to apply a more precise knowledge of the older forms of the language to the interpretation of their texts. It is from the collections of these men that modern scholarship, working with a more rigorous method, starts. And in doing honour to Ernst Windisch at his passing, Irish scholars of to-day do honour to the whole generation whose self-sacrificing and laborious work they have the duty of carrying on to a further stage of knowledge.

ROBIN FLOWER.

---

#### DR. OTTO SCHRADER

WE have to record with regret the death, on March 24, of Dr. Otto Schrader, Professor of Indo-Germanic Philology, at the University of Breslau, at the age of 64.

He was born at Weimar, and before his appointment at Breslau in succession to Hoffmann he had held the position of Extraordinary Professor of Indo-Germanic Philology at Jena University. His extensive travels in Russia between 1902 and 1908 were undertaken chiefly in pursuit of his studies in the Slav languages and civilization.

Though Dr. Schrader's attempt to determine the original home of the primitive Indo-Germans by the help of comparative philology and etymology has been severely challenged, his *magnum opus*, the *Reallexikon der indogermanischen Altertumskunde*, contains an immense amount of learning in a compact form. His *Sprachvergleichung und Urgeschichte* has been introduced to English readers of Dr. Jevons's translation under the title of *The Prehistoric Antiquities of the Aryan Peoples*.

# NOTES OF THE QUARTER

(January-March, 1919)

## I. GENERAL MEETINGS OF THE ROYAL ASIATIC SOCIETY

*January 14, 1919.*—Mr. M. Longworth Dames, Vice-President, in the Chair.

The following were elected members of the Society :—

Mr. Khwaja Amir Ahmad Ansary, B.A.

Mr. V. G. Bhat, B.A.

Mr. Yuhanna Dawud.

Mr. P. M. Debberman, B.Sc.

Mr. Lionel Giles, M.A., Litt.D.

Mr. Marino M. Lusy.

Major David Randall MacIvor, M.A.

Babu Joymongal Saha, B.A., B.L.

Mr. Saya Tun Pē, B.A.

Eleven nominations were approved for election at the next general meeting.

Mr. F. E. Pargiter, Vice-President, read a paper entitled “The Haihayas and King Sagara”. In the after discussion Sir George Grierson took part.

*February 11, 1919.*—Sir Henry Howorth, K.C.I.E., in the Chair.

The following were elected members of the Society :—

Professor Ram Chandra, B.A., LL.B.

Mr. Kripa Shankar Hajela, M.Sc., LL.B.

Mr. Lala Mohan Lal, M.A.

Mr. Satis Chandra Mitra, B.A.

Miss Frances E. Newton, F.R.G.S.

Mr. Suresh Chandra Patranavis.

Babu Mrityunjoy Rath.

Mr. Raghukul Tilak, F.R.E.S.



Mr. Ramji Das Vaishya, F.R.S.A.

Mr. H. T. Wickham.

Mr. Chauncy Winckworth.

Eight nominations were approved for election at the next general meeting.

Dr. Aylward Blackman read a paper entitled "The House of the Morning", followed by a discussion in which Dr. M. Gaster, Rev. G. Horner, Dr. Theophilus Pinches, and the Chairman took part.

*March 11, 1919.*—The Right Hon. Sir H. Mortimer Durand, P.C., G.C.M.G., and afterwards Sir Charles J. Lyall, K.C.S.I., Vice-President, in the Chair.

The following were elected members of the Society :—

Professor Dr. Walter E. Clark.

Professor T. S. Ganesier, M.A.

Babu Chhail Bihari Lal, M.A., LL.B.

Mr. William Montgomery McGovern.

Mr. R. Campbell Thompson, M.A., F.S.A.

Mrs. Wilfred Waite (since resigned).

Captain C. Leonard Woolley, V.C., R.F.A.

A paper was read by Mr. F. Legge, F.S.A., entitled "Alexander the Great and his Colonization of Asia", followed by a discussion in which Sir Henry Howorth, Dr. Hirschfeld, Brig.-Gen. Sir Percy M. Sykes, and the Chairman took part.

## II. PRINCIPAL CONTENTS OF ORIENTAL JOURNALS

### 1. JOURNAL OF THE AMERICAN ORIENTAL SOCIETY.

Vol. XXXVIII, Pt. v, December, 1918.

Edgerton (F.). Notes, mainly Textual, on Tantrākhyāyika, Book ii.

Carnoy (A.). The Iranian Gods of Healing.

Vol. XXXIX, Pt. i, February, 1919.

Brown (W. N.). The Pañcatantra in Modern Indian Folklore.

Tolman (H. C.). A possible Restoration from a Middle Persian Source of the Answer of Jesus to Pilate's Inquiry "What is Truth?"

2. ANNALES DU SERVICE DES ANTIQUITÉS DE L'EGYPTE.

Tome XVIII, Fasc. ii.

Daressy (G.). Statue de Zedher le Sauveur.

—— Inscriptions tentyrites.

—— Une mesure égyptienne de 20 *hin*.

Edgar (C. C.). Selected papyri from the Archives of Zenon (Nos. 1-10).

Gauthier (H.). Les stèles de l'an iii de Taharga de Medinet-Habou.

Quibell (J. E.). A Visit to Siwa.

3. THE ASIATIC REVIEW. N.S., Vol. XV, No. xli, January, 1919.

Lely (Sir F. S. P.). The Report on Indian Constitutional Reform.

Parker (Professor E. H.). The Fight for the Republic in China.

Anderson (J. D.). India in France.

Thorburn (S. S.). India: A Democracy?

Ranga Rao Bahadur (Maharajah Sir V. S.). Some Remarks on the Village Gods of South India as described by the Lord Bishop of Madras.

No. xlii, April, 1919.

Donovan (J. P.). The Press of China.

Keng (Dr. Lim Boon). The Confucian Way of thinking of the World and God.

4. JOURNAL ASIATIQUE. Sér. XI, Tome XI, No. iii,

Mai-Juin, 1918.

Woods (J. Haughton). La théorie de la connaissance dans le système du Yoga.

Ferrand (G.). Malaka, le Malāyu, et Malāyur.

Przyluski (J.). Le Parinirvāṇa et les funérailles du Buddha.

5. THE CALCUTTA REVIEW. No. 293, July, 1918.

Jameson (A. Keith). A Forgotten Military Expedition in Bengal.

Dunn (T. O. D.). Bengali Writers of English Verse.

Kydd (J. C.). The First Indian Factories Act (Act XV of 1881).

Mulvaney (John). Bengal Jails in Early Days.

Das Gupta (J. N.). A Legendary History of Alexander the Great.

Birt (F. B. Bradley). Chandernagore.

6. CEYLON ANTIQUARY AND LITERARY REGISTER. Vol. IV,  
Pt. iii, January, 1919.

Stubbs (Hon. Mr. R. E.). The Study of Ceylon History.

Turner (L. J. B.). The Civil Government of the Maritime Provinces of Ceylon, 1798-1805.

Senaveratne (John M.). The Chariot, State Car, and other Vehicles in Ancient Ceylon.

Perera (Rev. G. S.). The Jesuits in Ceylon in the Sixteenth and Seventeenth Centuries.

Gunawardhana (W. F.). The Kókila Sandésa ("Cuckoo Message"). (*Continued.*)

7. BULLETIN DE L'ÉCOLE FRANÇAISE D'EXTRÊME-ORIENT.  
Tome XVIII, No. vi.

Cœdès (G.). Le Royaume de Çrivijaya.

No. vii.

Cadière (L.). Croyances et Pratiques religieuses des Annamites dans les environs de Hué. 1. Le culte des arbres.

8. EPIGRAPHIA INDICA. Vol. XIV, Pt. ii, April, 1917.

Sewell (R.). The True Longitude of the Sun in Hindu Astronomy.

Venkoba Rao (G.). Dandapalle Plates of Vijaya-Bhupali : Saka-Samvat 1332.

Gopinatha Rao (T. A.). Srirangam Plates of Mummadi Nayaka : Saka-Samvat 1280.

Pt. iii, July, 1917.

Sukthankar (V. S.). The Porumamilla Tank Inscription of Bhaskara Bhavadura : Saka 1291.

— Bhandak Plates of Krishnaraja I : Saka 694.

Hirananda Sastri. Haraha Inscription of the Reign of Isanavarman : Vikrama-Samvat 611.

Konow (Sten). The Ara Inscription of Kanishka II : the year 41.

— Sanjan Plates of Buddhavarasa.

Pt. iv, October, 1917.

Konow (Sten). Sanjan Plates of Buddhavarasa. (*Continued.*)

Sukthankar (V. S.). A new Andhra Inscription of Siri-Pulumavi.

Banerji (R. D.). The Naihati Grant of Vallala-Sena : the 11th year.

Dikshit (K. N.). Sangoli Plates of Hari-Varman : the 8th year.

Venkateswara (S. V.) and Viswanatha (S. V.). Udayambakam Grant of Krishna-Deva Raya : Saka 1450.

Ojha (Gaurishankar Hirachand). Partabgarh Inscription of the time of (the Pratihara) King Mahendra-Pala II of Mahodaya : Samvat 1008.

Barnett (L. D.). Lakshmeshwar Pillar Inscription of the Yuvaraja Vikramaditya.

Sahni (Daya Ram). Chandravati Plates of Chandra Deva : V.S. 1150 and 1156.

Pt. vi, April, 1918.

Sewell (R.). The True Longitude of the Sun in Hindu Astronomy. The Siddhanta-Siromani.

Barnett (L. D.). Two Inscriptions from Kurgod.  
 Konow (Sten). Taxila Inscription of the year 136.

9. THE GEOGRAPHICAL JOURNAL. Vol. LIII, No. ii,  
 February, 1919.

Crauford (Lieut.-Commander C.). The Dhopar District.  
 Heawood (E.). Ctesiphon and the Palace of Khosroes.

No. iv, April, 1919.

Coales (Oliver). Eastern Tibet.

10. INDIAN ANTIQUARY. Vol. XLVII, Pt. dxciv, April, 1918.  
 Temple (Sir R. C., Bart.). Austria's Commercial Venture  
 in India in the Eighteenth Century.

Gopinatha Rao (T.). Vivekapatramala.

Jacobi (H.). A Contribution towards the Early History of  
 Indian Philosophy, translated by Dr. V. S. Sukthankar.  
 Banerji (R. D.). The Pratihara Occupation of Magadha.

Part dxcv.

Haig (Lieut.-Colonel T. W.). The Farugi Dynasty of  
 Khandesh.

Gopinatha Rao (T.). Vivekapatramala.

Das Gupta (H. C.). On a peculiar polished Hammer-stone  
 from Singhbhum, Chota Nagpur.

Hiralal (Rai Bahadur). Trimurtis in Bundelkhand.

11. JOURNAL OF THE KOREA BRANCH OF THE ROYAL  
 ASIATIC SOCIETY. Vol. IX.

An Account of the Shipwreck of a Dutch Vessel on the  
 Coast of the Isle of Quelpaert, together with the  
 Description of the Kingdom of Corea. Translated out  
 of the French.

12. THE KOREA MAGAZINE. February, 1919.

Ancient Korean Remains. V (Pu-yu).

March, 1919.

Ancient Korean Remains. VII (Kaya).

## 13. THE QUARTERLY JOURNAL OF THE MYTHIC SOCIETY.

Vol. IX, No. ii, January, 1919.

Venkatasubbiah (Dr. A.). Kalidasa's Sociological Ideals.

Wigery (Professor A. G.). Salvation and Redemption from Sin and Suffering as taught by some Oriental Religions.

Sankara Aiyar (K. G.). The Early Kings of Nepal.

Gopinatha Rao (T. A.). Bhushana Lakshanam, or a description of Ornaments usually worn by Indian images.

Cammiade (L. A.). Some Primitive Stone Images from the Mysore Plateau.

## 14. LE MONDE ORIENTAL. Vol. XI, Fasc. ii, 1917.

Rescher (O.). Et-Ta'âlibî: Man gâba 'anhu 'l-mutrib.

Übersetzt von O.R. I. Einleitung.

Vol. XII, Fasc. i, 1918.

Moberg (Axel). Zwei ägyptische waqf-urkunden aus dem Jahre 691/1292.

Lindquist (Sigurd). Zum toxri-problem.

Fasc. ii, 1918.

Rescher (O.). Et-Ta'âlibî: Man gâba 'anhu 'l-mutrib.

Übersetzt von O. R. II. Kapitel 5. Weinlieder.

## 15. PALESTINE EXPLORATION FUND. Quarterly Statement, January, 1919.

Notes on Jerusalem Water Supply.

Masterman (Dr. E. W. G.). Hygiene and Disease in Palestine in Modern and in Biblical Times. (*Concluded.*)Offord (Joseph). Archæological Notes on Jewish Antiquities. (*Continued.*)

— The Mountain Throne of Jahveh.

— The Gypsies of Palestine.

April, 1919.

Offord (Joseph). A Nabataean Inscription concerning Philip, Tetrarch of Auranitis.

16. T'OUNG PAO. Tome XVIII, No. iii, Juillet, 1917.  
Gauchet (L). Note sur la trigonométrie sphérique de  
Kouo Cheou-king.  
Cordier (Henri). Le début des Anglais dans l'Extrême-  
Orient.
17. THE TŌYŌ-GAKUHŌ. Reports of the Investigations of the  
Oriental Society. Vol. IX, No. i.  
Haneda (Bungakushi T.). The Kiu-sing Hui-hu and the  
Toguz-Oyuz.  
Katô (S.). Distinctions made during the Han Dynasty  
between the National Finance and the Imperial House-  
hold Economy, and a General View of the latter.  
(*Continued.*)  
Ikénchi (Bungakushi H.). Fort Kung-hsien and a Riber  
Su-hsia.
-

## ADDITIONS TO THE LIBRARY

---

- Bharati, Sebananda.** Tāmlukera Itihās. A History of Tamluk, or a Brief Account of the Ancient Kingdom of Tamralipta in Southern Bengal. pp. xvii, 160. *Calcutta*, 1919 (B.S.).  
*From the Author.*
- Burhan bin Mohamed Mukella and Saleh bin Ali.** El-Tamrin. Book of Primary Lessons on Grammar, part i. Containing Parts of Speech. 1918.  
*From the Authors.*
- BURMESE MSS.** 1. Nami Jataka, 59 leaves. 2. Vidhara Jataka, 92 leaves.  
*Presented by Mrs. Picot.*
- Christensen, A.** Contes Persans en Langue Populaire, publiés avec une traduction et des notes. Det Kgl. Danske Videnskabernes Selskab. Historisk-filologiske Meddelelser, i, 3. København. Andr. Fred. Høst & Søn, 1918.  
*From the Author.*
- Cunningham, Joseph Davey.** A History of the Sikhs from the Origin of the Nation to the Battles of the Sutlej. New and revised edition, with 2 maps, edited by H. L. D. Garrett. pp. lii, 429. *London*, 1918.  
*From the Publisher.*
- Dames, M. Longworth.** Book of Duarte Barbosa. An account of the countries bordering on the Indian Ocean and their inhabitants: written by Duarte Barbosa, and completed about the year 1518 A.D. Translated from the Portuguese Text, vol. i. pp. lxxxv, 238. *London*, Hakluyt Society, 1918.  
*From the Author.*
- Das, Sri Pyari Mohan.** Itivṛtta tattva va Aryya-anaryya bubutsu. pp. vi, 60. *Calcutta*, 1922 (B.S.).  
*From Mr. S. Bharati.*
- Faddegon, Dr. B.** The Vaiṣeṣika-System described with the help of the oldest texts. Verhandelingen der Koninklijke Akademie van Wetenschappen te Amsterdam. Afdeeling Letterkunde, Nieuwe Reeks. Deel xviii, No. 2. pp. 614. *Amsterdam*, 1918.  
*From the Author.*



**Gune, Pandurang Damodar.** An Introduction to Comparative Philology. pp. xvi, 252, xii. *Poona*, 1918.

*From the Publishers.*

**Havell, E. B.** The History of Aryan Rule in India. From the earliest times to the death of Akbar. *London*, 1918.

*From the Publishers.*

**Keiser, Clarence Elwood, Ph.D.** Babylonian Inscriptions in the Collection of James B. Nies. Vol. I: Letters and Contracts from Erech written in the Neo-Babylonian Period. pp. 42, pls. lx. Yale, University Press and Oxford University Press. 1918. *From the Publishers.*

**Keith, A. Berriedale.** The Samkhya System, a history of the Samkhya Philosophy. pp. 109. *Calcutta*, 1918.

*From the Publisher.*

**Kern, Professor H.** Verspreide Geschriften (achtste deel). 's *Gravenhage*, 1919.

*From the Publishers.*

**Kincaid, G. A., and D. B. Parasnis.** A History of the Maratha People. Vol. I: From the earliest times to the death of Shivajee. pp. ii, 294. *London*, 1918. *From the Publisher.*

**Kraeling, Emil G. H.** Aram and Israel, or the Aramæans in Syria and Mesopotamia. Columbia University Oriental Studies, vol. xiii. pp. xiv, 155. *New York*, 1918.

*From the Publishers.*

**Latourette, K. S.** The Development of Japan. Published under the auspices of the Japan Society. pp. 237.

*From the Publishers.*

**Le Strange, G.** The Geographical Part of the Nuzhat-al-Qulub, composed by Hamd-Allāh Mustawfi of Qazwīn in 740 (1340). pp. xix, 288. Gibb Memorial Fund. Leyden: E. J. Brill, Imprimerie Orientale. *London*: Luzac & Co. 1919.

**Macartney, Carlile H. H.** The Diwān of Ghailān ibn 'Uqbah, known as Dhu'r-Rummah. 4to; pp. xxxix, 676. *Cambridge*, 1919.

*From the Publishers.*

**Maunder, Mrs. A. S. D.** Uranian Migrations before History.  
Reprint from *Scientia*. Bologna, February, 1916.

*From the Author.*

From astronomical data the author concludes that the Sacred Books of Persia preserve the memory of two great prehistoric migrations of the Iranians: first, a very early migration southward from within the Arctic Circle; secondly, a much later migration westward from the Panjab. These conclusions are drawn (a) from certain notices of Arctic conditions preserved in the *Vendidad*, *Fargard II*, etc., which the author thinks must be the description of actual experiences within the Arctic Circle; and (b) a calculation of the annual rainfall of the Panjab, which agrees with notices found in the *Yashts*, and could not have arisen in Persia, where the conditions are of a different kind.

— **Astronomical Allusions in Sacred Books of the East.**  
Paper read before the Victoria Institute. April, 1915.

*From the Author.*

A study of the origins and date of the apocalyptic books 4th Ezra, Slavonic Enoch, and Ethiopic Enoch in the light of the astronomical allusions found in these books. The author believes that they had their source in Parthia, not in Palestine, and that they were written under Magian, not Maccabæan influences. She considers Slavonic Enoch to be a late and worthless mediæval production, compiled by a maker of horoscopes and very inferior to a possibly contemporary astronomical tract founded on the Arabic treatise of Messahalah (c. 800 A.D.), of which an Irish version has been published by the Irish Texts Society. Mrs. Maunder would give a later date to the Books of Enoch and Jubilees than that assigned to them by Dr. Charles, and she does not consider that St. Jude quoted from the Book of Enoch or Enoch from Jude; she considers that both incorporated an already familiar prophecy.

**Mercer, S. A. B.** Sumero-Babylonian Sign List, to which is added an Assyrian Sign List and a Catalogue of the

Numerals, Weights, and Measures used at various periods. Columbia University Oriental Studies, vol. xiv. Columbia University Press. *New York*, 1918. *From the Publishers.*

**Miles**, Colonel S. B. The Countries and Tribes of the Persian Gulf. 2 vols. pp. 264, 643. *London*, 1919.  
*From the Publishers.*

**Nivedita**, Sister. The Web of Indian Life. With an Introduction by Sir RABINDRANATH TAGORE. New edition. pp. viii, 276. *London*, 1918. *From the Publishers.*

**Ojha**, G. H. Indian Palæography. New and revised edition. *Ajmere*, 1918. *From the Author.*

**Perry**, W. J. War and Civilisation. Lecture delivered at the John Ryland Library on February 13, 1918.

**Phillott**, Lieut.-Colonel D. C. Hindustani Manual. 3rd edition. *Calcutta*, 1918. *From the Author.*

**Porter**, Robert P. Japan: the Rise of a Modern Power.

**Rawley**, Ratan C. The Silk Industry and Trade. A Study in the Economic Organization of the Export Trade of Kashmir and Indian Silks, with Special Reference to their Utilization in the British and French Markets. pp. 172, 4 plates. *From the Publishers.*

RECORDS OF FORT ST. GEORGE. (1) Letters from Fort St. George for 1688. Fol.; pp. 16, 104. (2) Diary and Consultation Book of 1694. Fol.; pp. 154, vi. *Madras*, 1918. 2 copies.  
*From the India Office and the Government of India.*

**Rice**, Edward P. A History of Kanarese Literature. The Heritage of India Series. pp. iii, 101. *Calcutta and London*, 1919. *From the Publishers.*

ROWLATT SEDITION COMMITTEE REPORT. 1918.  
*From the Government of India.*

**Shirreff, A. G., and Panna Lall.** The Dream Queen ; a Translation of the Svapnavasavadatta of Bhasa.

**Smith, Helmer.** Sutta-Nipāta Commentary III, being Paramatthajotikā, ii, 3. Vol. iii. *Purchased.*

**Smith, Vincent A.** The Oxford History of India. pp. 816. Oxford, Clarendon Press, 1919. *From the Publishers.*

**Stephen, Dorothea Jane.** Studies in Early Indian Thought. pp. 176. Cambridge, 1918. *From the Author.*

TRANSACTIONS OF THE ROYAL HISTORICAL SOCIETY. Fourth series. Vol. i. 1918.

**Wensinck, A. J.** Bar Hebraeus's Book of the Dove ; together with some Chapters from his Ethikon. Translated by A. J. W. With an Introduction, Notes, and Registers. Printed for the Trustees of the "De Goeje Fund". No. iv. pp. cxxxvi, 142. Index. Leyden, E. J. Brill, 1919. *From the Author.*

— The Ocean in the Literature of the Western Semites. Verhandelingen der Koninklijke Akademie van Wetenschappen te Amsterdam. Afdeeling Letterkunde, Nieuwe Reeks. Deel xix, No. 2. Amsterdam, Johannes Müller, 1918. *From the Author.*

**Werner, Alice.** Introductory Sketch of the Bantu Languages. London, Kegan Paul & Co., Ltd., 1919. *From the Publishers.*

**Williams, L. F. Rushbrook.** An Empire Builder of the Sixteenth Century. A summary account of the Political career of Zahir-ud-Din Muhammad, surnamed \*Babur. Being the University Lectures for 1915-16. Publications of the Department of Modern Indian History, Allahabad University. No. iii. pp. xiv, 187. London, 1918. *From the Publishers.*

## VOLUMES MISSING FROM LIBRARY

KLAPROTH. *Mémoires relatifs à l'Asie*. Vol. I. 8vo. Maps and plates. Paris, 1824-8.

PROCEEDINGS OF THE SOCIETY OF BIBLICAL ARCHÆOLOGY.  
Vol. IX. 1886. Parts iii-vi.

(The Librarian would be glad to know of any other parts of the PSBA. available, especially Vol. I, pt. i (Transactions); Vols. IV-VIII, 1875-9; Vol. XVIII, 1895; Vol. XXIV, 1902; Vol. XXIX, 1907; Vol. XXXII, 1910; Vols. XXXV-XXXVIII, 1913-16.)

TRANSACTIONS OF THE INTERNATIONAL CONGRESS OF  
ORIENTALISTS. Eighth Session, between 1889 and 1893.  
Twelfth Session, between 1899 and 1902.

Can any member supply copies of the above volumes?

---

THE JOURNAL  
OF  
THE ROYAL ASIATIC SOCIETY




THE  
JOURNAL  
OF THE  
ROYAL ASIATIC SOCIETY  
OF  
GREAT BRITAIN AND IRELAND  
FOR THE SECOND HALF-YEAR OF 1919



PUBLISHED BY THE SOCIETY  
22 ALBEMARLE STREET, LONDON, W.



STEPHEN AUSTIN AND SONS, LIMITED



PRINTERS, HERTFORD

# CONTENTS

## FOR THE SECOND HALF-YEAR OF 1919

### ARTICLES

XI.	Graves of Europeans in the Armenian Cemetery at Işfahān. By Lieut.-Colonel T. W. HAIG, C.M.G. . . . .	321
XII.	Sagara and the Haihayas, Vasiṣṭha and Aurva. By F. E. PARGITER . . . . .	353
XIII.	Pictographic Reconnaissances. Part III. By L. C. HOPKINS. (With Plate.) . . . .	369
XIV.	Portrait of Gosāñ Jadrūp. By ANANDA K. COOMARASWAMY. (With Plate.) . . . .	389
XV.	The Aryan Invasion of Northern India: an Essay in Ethnology and History. By JAMES KENNEDY . . . . .	493
XVI.	Gesture in Sumerian and Babylonian Prayer. By S. LANGDON, Ph.D. (With a folding Plate.) . . . .	531
XVII.	On the Japanese Sotoba, or Elemental Stūpa. By JAMES TROUP. (With a folding Plate and Text-figures.) . . . . .	557
XVIII.	The Legend of the Divine Lovers: Enlil and Ninlil. By THEOPHILUS G. PINCHES . . . .	575

### MISCELLANEOUS COMMUNICATIONS

A	Note on the Chinese Atlas in the Magliabecchian Library, with reference to Kinsay in Marco Polo. By A. C. M. . . . .	393
Khāravela.	By RAMĀPRASĀD CHANDA . . . . .	395
Satiyaputra of the Asoka Edicts.	By S. KRISHNASWAMI AIYANGAR . . . . .	581
Ethnology of the Philippines.	By C. O. BLAGDEN . . . . .	584
The Date of the Book of Job.	By VICTOR L. TRUMPER . . . . .	586
Graves of Europeans at Isfahan.	By JOHN L. MYRES . . . . .	588
"Anglo-Indians"	. . . . .	588
A 'Ladies' College in Cappadocia in the Third Millennium B.C.	By A. H. SAYCE . . . . .	588

NOTICES OF BOOKS		PAGE
M. L. DAMES. The Book of Duarte Barbosa. Vol. I. Reviewed by R. C. TEMPLE . . . . .		401
The Dance of Siva. By DOUGLAS AINSLIE . . . . .		414
VINCENT A. SMITH, C.I.E., Litt.D. The Oxford History of India, from the earliest times to the end of 1911. By W. F. . . . .		420
A. BERRIEDALE KEITH. The Sāṅkhya System.— DOROTHEA JANE STEPHEN. Studies in Early Indian Thought. By L. D. B. . . . .		421
RAO BAHADUR R. NARASIMHACHAR, M.A. Annual Report of the Mysore Archaeological Department for the Year 1918. By L. D. B. . . . .		423
ALÍYU'BNU - 'L - ḤASAN 'EL - KHAZREJYY. The Pearl- Strings. Vol. V. By C. J. L. . . . .		423
G. R. KAYE, F.R.A.S. The Astronomical Observatories of Jai Singh. By A. S. D. M. . . . .		427
W. A. IVANOW. Ismaili MSS. in the Asiatic Museum. By E. DENISON ROSS . . . . .		429
Lieut.-Colonel D. C. PHILLOTT. Hindustani Manual. Third edition. By GEORGE A. GRIERSON . . . . .		435
Lieut.-Colonel D. C. PHILLOTT. Colloquial English- Persian Dictionary in the Roman Character. By D. L. R. LORIMER . . . . .		437
Fuṣūl wa-Ghāyāt. By D. S. M. . . . .		449
A. J. WENSINCK. Bar Hebræus's Book of the Dove, together with some Chapters from his Ethikon. By M. GASTER . . . . .		593
Professor S. KRISHNASWAMI AYYANGAR. The Beginnings of South Indian History. By V. A. S. . . . .		596
EDMUND CANDLER. The Sepoy. By R. CAMPBELL THOMPSON . . . . .		599
RATAN C. RAWLLEY, M.A. The Silk Industry and Trade. By H. A. R. . . . .		600
Colonel S. B. MILES. The Countries and Tribes of the Persian Gulf. By P. M. SYKES . . . . .		601
R. CAMPBELL THOMPSON, F.S.A. A Small Handbook to the History and Antiquities of Mesopotamia from the Earliest Times to the End of the Sasanian Period. By D. L. . . . .		605

	PAGE
Recent Arabic Literature. By D. S. M. . . . .	607
Murray's Handbook for Travellers in India, Burma, and Ceylon. Tenth Edition. By V. A. S. . . . .	612
W. J. PERRY. The Megalithic Culture of Indonesia. By C. O. BLAGDEN . . . . .	614
RAI BAHADUR PANDIT GAURISHANKAR HIRACHAND OJHA. The Palæography of India. By J. PH. V. . . . .	617
C. H. H. MACARTNEY. The Diwân of Ghailân ibn 'Uqbah, known as Dhu 'r-Rumma. By R. A. N. . . . .	619

---

### OBITUARY NOTICE

LEONARD WILLIAM KING. By R. CAMPBELL THOMPSON	625
---	-----

---

### NOTES OF THE QUARTER

General Meetings of the Royal Asiatic Society . . . . .	451, 627
Anniversary Meeting . . . . .	451
Presentation of the Pinhey Memorial Medal to Mr. H. Cousens . . . . .	627
Presentation of the Royal Asiatic Society's Public Schools Gold Medal for 1919. . . . .	637

---

ADDITIONS TO THE LIBRARY . . . . .	479, 641
------------------------------------	----------

---

INDEX FOR 1919 . . . . .	655
--------------------------	-----

### TRANSLITERATION OF THE SANSKRIT, ARABIC, AND ALLIED ALPHABETS.

### TITLE-PAGE AND CONTENTS FOR THE SECOND HALF-YEAR.

### TITLE-PAGE AND CONTENTS FOR THE YEAR.

### ALPHABETICAL LIST OF AUTHORS FOR THE YEAR.

### LIST OF MEMBERS.

---



# JOURNAL

OF THE

## ROYAL ASIATIC SOCIETY

### 1919

---

#### XI

#### GRAVES OF EUROPEANS IN THE ARMENIAN CEMETERY AT ISFAHAN

BY LIEUT.-COLONEL T. W. HAIG, C.M.G.

THE Armenian cemetery at Iṣfahān is an arid and waterless tract of desert land lying to the south of the city, between the Armenian suburb of New Julfa and the high hill known as the Kūh-i-Šuffah, and was granted to the community by Shāh ‘Abbās the Great (1587–1629), who transported the colony of Armenians from Julfa on the Araxes to his capital and granted to them the tract of land on the southern bank of the Zāyandah Rūd, opposite to the city, where the suburb which they named after their old home in Armenia now stands. Here they have enjoyed, from the time of Shāh ‘Abbās, various privileges, not uninterrupted by periods of oppression and persecution. They have been allowed to build churches, of which the suburb now contains twelve, including All Saints’, the Cathedral Church of the extensive Armenian diocese of Persia and India, to practise their religion freely, and even to offend the ears of pious Muslims with the sound of church bells. As the only domiciled Christian community they have ever shown hospitality to foreign Christians visiting or living in Iṣfahān, have

publicly welcomed the envoys of Christian states, and have freely allowed foreigners the privilege of Christian burial in their cemetery, which even contains the graves of missionaries sent to Iṣfahān for the purpose of disturbing the unity of their ancient National Church. Englishmen, Swiss, Dutchmen, Frenchmen, Russians, and Portuguese lie buried here, besides one Pole and one Greek, and there are some tombs without epitaphs which are undoubtedly those of foreigners. The dry climate of the Persian plateau has preserved the epitaphs so well that nearly all of them are as legible as when freshly cut.

The oldest foreign tomb is that of an Englishman, and bears the following inscription:—

## I

Gulielmus Bell  
Joan. F. Northumbri—  
Apud Regem Abbas  
Pro Angliâ Agiens [*sic*]  
Año Dñi 1624 Aet. suae  
33 mensis Feb. die 24  
Ispahani defunctus.

Ad pium peregrinum:

## Hexastichon

Vive domi sed vive Deo, sic sera Senectus  
Colliget ad charos membra soluta patres.  
Longinquis vitam dum conor quaerere regnis  
Heu juvenem incautum mors inopina premit.  
Sed Christum vivens colui, moriensque vocavi,  
Et vixi quantum vixerat Ille. Sat est.

*Translation*

William Bell, son of John (Bell), a Northumbrian, Agent for England at the Court of Shāh 'Abbās. Died at Iṣfahān February 24, A.D. 1624, in the 33rd year of his age.

To the pious pilgrim:

## Hexastich

Roam not; but live to God, so tardy Age  
Shall gather to thy fathers thy remains.

I sought my livelihood in realms afar,  
 And death untimely punished my rash youth.  
 Christ loved I living, dying invoked His name :  
 My years have equalled His. It is enough.

## II

Near this grave, on the southern side of the cemetery, is the grave of another Englishman, bearing nothing but the name of the deceased, as follows :—

WILLI  
 MWEAL  
 E.

## III

In the same neighbourhood is the grave of a third Englishman, bearing a much more elaborate inscription :—

Memento mori

Hic iacet insignis Doctor R<sup>lus</sup> Edvardus Pagett, Anglus,  
 SS<sup>us</sup> Trinitatis Collegii apud Cantabrigiam Socius.  
 Theologus et mathematicus lustrabat orbem ter<sup>rum</sup>  
 Ut divina cognosceret et mundana ;  
 Sed, mundum vere reputans ut punctum,  
 Extendebat lineas ultra tempus  
 Ut pulchrum ex aeternitate circulum formaret.  
 Tandem quinquagenarius ultimo puncto vitam clausit,  
 In patriam per terram redeuntem sistebat Mors ;  
 Obiit enim Spahani die 21 Janu<sup>arii</sup> A<sup>no</sup> 170<sup>2</sup>/<sub>3</sub> sec<sup>undum</sup> styl. vet.

Abi viator et ab insigni Doctore

Disce in tempore aeternitatem.

*Translation*

Remember death

Here lies the famous Doctor, the Reverend Edward Pagett, an Englishman, Fellow of Trinity College, Cambridge. A theologian and a mathematician, he reviewed the earth that he might acquire a knowledge of matters divine and mundane, but regarding the world, indeed, but as a point, he produced his lines beyond time that he might describe a fair circle from eternity. At length, at the age of 50, he closed his life with



its last point, and death fixed him as he was returning homeward overland ; for he died at Iṣfahān Jan. 21, 170 $\frac{2}{3}$  O.S.

Depart, traveller, and from the famous Doctor learn, in time, to understand eternity.

I much regret that I have access to no books of reference likely to throw any light on the history of these three Englishmen. The records of the East India Company would probably yield some information and of Dr. Pagett, who was a Doctor of Divinity and a Fellow of his College, and bore a well-known English name, something might be learnt from the archives of Trinity College and possibly from family histories. He was possibly a Nonjuror, seeking in travel a means of escape from English politics.

Near these graves are three bearing French epitaphs, as follows :—

#### IV

Ci gît  
Louis  
Rouper  
Lorain  
Orfèvre  
Décédé  
L'[an] 1673.

#### *Translation*

Here lies Louis Rouper, a Lorrainer. Goldsmith. Died in 1673.

#### V

Cy gît  
Michel  
Bourri  
Suisse  
Décédé  
L'an  
1673.

#### *Translation*

Here lies Michel Bourri, a Swiss. Died in 1673.

## VI

Cy gît  
Rodolfe

*Translation*

Here lies Rodolfe.

Of this last tomb, with its simple epitaph, more is known than of the others. Jean Chardin says in his *Travels*<sup>1</sup>: " Parmi ces tombeaux il y en a un d'un Horloger nommé Rodolphe, Allemand [*sic*], Protestant, qu'on peut dire qui souffrit le Martyre, sous le règne de Sefi premier (1629-1642); car quoiqu'on le fit mourir parce qu'il avoit tué un homme en se défendant, le Roi ne laissa pas de lui faire offrir avec tant d'empressement durant un si long-tems la vie, et toute sorte de biens et d'honneurs, s'il vouloit se faire Mahometan, qu'on ne lui peut refuser le glorieux titre de Martyr. Les Arméniens vont tous les jours à son sepulcre brûler de l'encens et des bougies, casser des pots et jetter le sort. Ils sont assez superstitieux pour croire que si quelqu'un attaqué de fièvres casse le pot dans lequel il a coutume de boire sur la fosse d'un homme mis à mort injustement, il guerira peu après, et ils ne doutent pas que cet Allemand [*sic*] n'ait été traité ainsi, puisque celui qu'il avoit tué l'attaquoit le sabre à la main, pour lui ôter la vie. Ces gens jettent le sort, en laissant tomber cinq petits cailloux sur la fosse, et s'ils tombent rangez en croix, c'est un bon augure. Ils croient que le merite du Martyr, ou de tout autre saint personnage sur la fosse duquel ils cherchent à s'éclaircir de leurs doutes les y fait parvenir et les tirent de la peine où ils se trouvent."

Armenians no longer assemble at Rodolfe's tomb, and divination by the method described by Chardin is no longer practised, for the tombstone has subsided unevenly,

<sup>1</sup> Ed. 1711, vol. viii, p. 235. But Chardin is mistaken in making Rodolfe a German. He was a Swiss.

and the surface is so far from level that pebbles dropped on to it roll on to the ground.

Near these graves a Frenchman lies buried,

## VII

Hic iacet  
D. Marcus Xav<sup>r</sup>  
De Marez Gall<sup>s</sup>  
Obiit 31 Maii  
1673.

### *Translation*

Here lies Monsieur Marc Xavier de Marez, a Frenchman.  
Died May 31, 1673.

Other old graves of Europeans in this part of the cemetery are those of Dutchmen, mostly members of the Dutch East India Company. The spelling of the various Dutch epitaphs, untrammelled as it is by uniformity, has been preserved.

## VIII

Hier leydt begraven Huybert Buckens in syn Leven Asst. wegens de N<sup>l<sup>de</sup></sup> Oost-Indische Comp<sup>e</sup> en Diamant Slyper in Dienst van de Coninck van Persien. Obyt den 25<sup>em</sup> December, A<sup>o</sup> 1658.

### *Translation*

Here lies buried Hubert Buckens, in his life Assistant in the Dutch East India Company and diamond cutter in the service of the King of Persia. Died December 25, 1658.

This is the earliest Dutch epitaph in the cemetery, although the Dutch Company was established in Persia in 1623.

## IX

Hier legt begraven  
Willem Lok in syn Leven  
Onderkoopman der Neder-  
-lantsche Oostindische  
Comp<sup>e</sup>. Sterft den 12<sup>em</sup>  
January, A<sup>o</sup> 1663.

*Translation*

Here lies buried William Lok, in his life a junior merchant of the Dutch East India Company. Died January 12, 1663.

## X

Hic iacet  
D. Jacobus  
Kemel Hol-  
-land<sup>s</sup> Obi-  
-it 3 Janu<sup>i</sup>  
1670.

*Translation*

Here lies Mijnheer James (or Jacob) Kemel, a Dutchman. Died January 3, 1670.

## XI

Hier leyt begraven Frederick  
Bouduwyns in syn Leven Onder-  
-coopm<sup>n</sup> wegens de N<sup>ost</sup> Oost-Indise  
Comp<sup>o</sup> Obyt den 17<sup>en</sup> January  
A<sup>o</sup> 1673.

*Translation*

Here lies buried Frederick Bouduwyns, in his life a junior merchant in the Dutch East India Company. Died January 17, 1673.

## XII

Hier leyt begraven Georgh [*sic*] Wilmson  
in syn Leven Coopman en Hooft wegens  
D N<sup>ost</sup> Oost-Indise Comp<sup>o</sup> deses Compt<sup>rs</sup> Spahan  
Obyt 6<sup>en</sup> Maart  
A<sup>o</sup> 1675.

*Translation*

Here lies buried George Wilmson, in his life merchant and superintendent in the Dutch East India Company, in the factory at Isfahān. Died March 6, 1675.

## XIII

Hier leyd begraven Fran-  
-çois Castelijn de Jonge. Obyt 12<sup>en</sup>  
Januā A<sup>o</sup> 1697 Oud 7 Maend.

*Translation*

Here lies buried François Castelijn the younger. Died January 12, 1697 O.S.

This is evidently the son of the lady buried in the next grave, for he is described as "the younger" and no official designation follows his name, whereas the husband of Sara Jacoba held a high position in the Dutch Company.

## XIV

Hier leyt begraven Sara Jacoba Six  
van Chandelier Vrouwe van François Castelijn  
Oppercoopman en Opperhoofd wegens de Nederl:  
Oost Indise Comp. tot Spahan. Obijt 9<sup>em</sup> Meij A° 1703.

*Translation*

Here lies buried Sara Jacoba Six (?) van Chandelier, wife of François Castelijn, senior merchant and senior superintendent in the Dutch East India Company at Isfahan. Died May 9, 1703.

On either side of this epitaph is an armorial achievement, the charges on which are fairly distinct, though, unfortunately, the tinctures cannot be determined, as the usual means of distinguishing them has not been adopted. The following is the achievement on the dexter side of the epitaph, the tinctures being necessarily left blank: — two bars enhanced — over all a triangle voided — apex in chief, and in base, within the triangle, an estoile of eight points —. Crest, a torch — inflamed —, between two wings elevated and addorsed —. These are, perhaps, the arms of the Dutch East India Company, with which I am not acquainted. On the sinister side of the epitaph is the following achievement: Party per pale, dexter, gules (?) three eagles displayed argent (?); sinister, party per fess, in chief — a cross — corded, and in base gules (?) three lozenges ermine (?).

François de Castelijn was probably a scion of the house of de Chastillon (Châtillon-sur-Marne), which had branches

in the Netherlands. The arms *gules, three eagles displayed, argent* are attributed by Papworth and Morant to a family of the name of Caston, probably derived from the same source. The arms *gules, three lozenges in fess, ermine* belong to a family called, by the same authority, Chastlion or Chastyon, an evident corruption of Chastillon. In the coat cut on this tombstone the lozenges are not arranged in fess but in the ordinary manner, two and one, but this may be a mistake of the local stonemason, for the stone was certainly cut in Isfahān, or either the coat cut on the stone or that given by Papworth and Morant may be a variant, borne by a cadet, of the original coat.

The history of this house has been written by André du Chesne, the title of the book being *Histoire de la Maison de Chastillon sur Marne, avec les Généalogies et Armes des illustres Familles de France et des Pays bas, par Andr. du Chesne*. Paris, 1621.

#### XV

Hier legt begraven  
Den A. Heer Mattheus Luup-ur  
in zyne Leven Ondercoopman  
en Opperhoovd in der Nederlandsche  
godr Ageende Oost Ind. Comp  
ten Comptoire Ispahan  
Obiit den 12 Novemb. 1730.

#### *Translation*

Here lies buried Heer Mattheus Luup-ur, in his life junior merchant and senior superintendent in the Dutch — agency, East India Company, in the Isfahān factory. Died November 12, 1730.

The epitaph is not clearly legible, not because it has been defaced, but because it has been cut in an extremely ornamental text hand, with many flourishes, probably by a mason who did not understand what he was cutting and worked from a copy which he did not faithfully reproduce.

Four Russians are buried in this part of the cemetery, two of whom were connected with an embassy, while the third was apparently a merchant or a traveller, and the fourth, an aide-de-camp to a Russian commander-in-chief, probably visited Isfahān in an official capacity. The epitaphs, which are cut in Slavonic characters, were extremely difficult to decipher owing to the manner in which space has been economized by amalgamating letters and by cutting some letters within others. The chief peculiarity of the spelling is the substitution of *o* for *o*, an error which I have not thought it necessary to preserve in the transcriptions. For the decipherment and translation of these epitaphs, and of the Polish epitaph which follows them, I am indebted to the great courtesy of Captain André Andreivich Balakin, of the Russian Army, at present Staff Officer to the Brigade of Persian Cossacks at Isfahān.

## XVI

Лѣто 71  
 95То М  
 яца Фе  
 враля  
 въ 10 вол  
 ею Бож-  
 -иею пр-  
 -став-  
 -ися ра-  
 -бъ Бож-  
 -іи Бори-  
 -съ Да-  
 -ниловъ  
 будуги-  
 -с посланникомъ Константиномъ  
 Христофоровъ геловѣкъ его  
 камень пожилъ посланниковъ  
 Елизар Родіоновъ Поршочкинъ

*Translation*

On February 10, A.M. 7195 (A.D. 1686) there departed this life, by the will of God, the servant of God, Boris Daniloff, who was with the Ambassador, Constantine Christophoroff by name. This stone was placed here by the Ambassador's man, Elizar Rodionoff Porshchokin.

The last four lines of the epitaph are cut round the edge of the stone.

## XVII

.Іѣго 7195  
мѣ  
то мѣсца  
Мая ѡ  
5 преста-  
-вися рабъ  
Божій Вел-  
-ихнєсъ Тосуда-  
-рей прик-  
-азу подъ  
ягій Дѣм-  
-итрііѡ Θεод-  
-оровъ III-  
-устовъ  
будути-  
-съ Послап-  
-никомъ  
Константиномъ  
Христофоровымъ

*Translation*

On May 5, A.M. 7195 (A.D. 1686) there departed this life the servant of God, the employé of the Ministry of Foreign Affairs of the Great Lords, Demetrius (son of) Theodore Shustoff, who was with the Ambassador Constantine Christophoroff.

## XVIII

Лѣта 7204 году  
мѣсяца Фев-  
-раля въ



6 день пр-  
 -стави-  
 -ся рабъ  
 Божій М-  
 -ихайло  
 Игнатъ-  
 -въ сынъ III-  
 -еляникъ-  
 -овъ

*Translation*

On February 6, A.M. 7204 (A.D. 1695) the servant of God, Michael (son of) Ignatius, son of Telyanikoff, departed this life.

XIX

Серосенского  
 Господина Геп-  
 -срала ан Шеф-  
 -тъ и Ковале-  
 -ра Василья  
 Яковлевич-  
 -а Левашова  
 Флигель Адью-  
 -тантъ сво Еро-  
 -фее Яковл-  
 -евъ сынъ  
 Левашовъ  
 погребенъ  
 насемъ лн-  
 -сесте 1732 Г-  
 -оду Февр-  
 -аля 4 дня

*Translation*

Erophei Yakovleff, son of Levashoff, Aide-de-camp to Vasilie Yakovlevich Levashoff, Knight, General-in-Chief of the (forces of the) Lord of all the Russias, is buried in this place, February 4, A.D. 1732.

As General Levashoff and his Aide-de-camp had the same surname and the same patronymic it is possible that they were brothers.

The next tomb is that of the only Pole buried in the cemetery and bears epitaphs in Russian and Polish.

## XX

Лѣта 7195 Дека-  
-бря пощю 26 числово-  
-лею Божією преставися  
въ Сиогани Посланникъ Коро-  
-левскаго Величества  
Полскаго Теодоръ  
Мирановичъ

Lezy tu cr-  
-zesznik Th-  
-eodor Mi-  
-ranowicz Po-  
-siannik Krula  
Ie. M. Polskiego  
Decembra 26,  
1686.

*Translation*

(Russian) Theodore Miranovich, Ambassador of His Royal Polish Majesty, departed this life, by God's will, on the night of December 26, A.M. 7195 (A.D. 1686), at Isfahān.

(Polish) Here lies a sinner, Theodore Miranowicz, Ambassador of His Majesty the King of Poland, December 26, 1686.

In the next grave lies buried a Greek of Constantinople, whose tombstone bears the following epitaph in uncial letters.

## XXI

ΕΝΘΑ  
ΔΕΚΗ  
ΤΕΟΔ  
ΣΛΟΣ  
ΤΕΘΕΟ  
ΥΙΟΑΝ  
ΑΚΗΣΘ  
ΗΜΗΑΝ

ΘΕΚΤΗ  
 ΣΒΑΣΗ  
 ΛΕΒΟΥ  
 ΣΗΤΟΝ  
 ΠΟ'ΛΕΟ  
 ΝΚΟΝΣ  
 ΤΑΝΤΙ  
 ΝΟΥΠ  
 ΟΛΙΣ

The spelling of the Greek is atrocious, and the grammar is worse. I am unable to reconstruct the whole of the epitaph, and the following attempt is as far as I can go:—

Ἐνθάδε κῆται ὁ δοῦλος τοῦ Θεοῦ Ἰοαννακῆς Θημημανοῦ ἐκ  
 τῆς βασιλεβούσης (ς?) τῆς πολέως Κουσταντινοπολέως.  
 Perhaps τῶν πολέων may be substituted for τῆς πολέως.

*Translation*

Here lies the servant of God, Ioannakis son of Thimianos, of the Royal . . . (?) of the city (or cities) of Constantinople.

In this part of the cemetery there are no other old tombs bearing epitaphs in European languages. Other tombs of Europeans here are all modern and of no interest. There is, however, another large group of tombs of Europeans and other foreigners, near the north-eastern corner of the cemetery. The earliest of these is that of a French physician.

XXII

Hic iacet  
 Johannes  
 Malom Natio-  
 -ne Gallus Relli-  
 -gione Romanus  
 Professione Med-  
 -icus. Obiit aetatis  
 suae 40 Anno Do. [sic]  
 1646.

*Translation*

Here lies John Malom, a Frenchman by nation, a Roman by religion, and a physician by profession. Died in the 40th year of his age, A.D. 1646.

The next grave is that of a French youth.

## XXIII

Orate pro eo.  
 Hic iacet  
 Carolus Du-  
 -voyer natiōe  
 Gallus Religi-  
 -one Roman<sup>s</sup> ob-  
 -iit Año Dñi 1649  
 Aet. 18.

Quo me fata trahunt? Iterum mors visere caros  
 Haud sinit, at plenos hic rapit ante dies.  
 Heu cœptis adversa meo quid funere tentas?  
 Num miserum his terris reddere forte cupis?  
 Falleris; ah dulcem capiunt hic membra quietem  
 Meque Deo cœlum mentē reduce beat.  
 Mors inimica viae patriis me tollere regnis  
 Dum putat, optatis reddit amica locis.

*Translation*

Pray for him. Here lies Charles Duvoyer, a Frenchman by nation, a Roman by religion. Died A.D. 1649, aged 18.

Hard fate! Cruel death, forbidding me again  
 To see my dear ones, cutting short my youth  
 In envy! What then wouldst thou with my corpse?  
 Canst thou commit me wholly to this earth?  
 Vain hope! For here my limbs find grateful ease  
 And through heaven's gate my soul returns to God.  
 Death, the foe, bars my way to earthly home,  
 Death, the friend, leads me where I fain would be.

The next two graves are those of two men, probably either brothers or father and son, bearing the strange name of Pantaleo (Pantaleone), whose nationality is not

mentioned. In order not to separate them I have inserted the second epitaph out of its proper chronological order.

## XXIV

Hic iacet hon-  
-orabilis homo  
Nicolaus Pant-  
-aleo Catholicus  
Obiit 25. aetatis  
suae die 23 Maii  
1659.

*Translation*

Here lies an honourable man, Nicolas Pantaleone, a Catholic.  
Died May 23, 1659, in the 25th year of his age.

## XXV

Hic ia-  
-cet H.  
Marcus  
Panta-  
-leo Ca-  
-tholi-  
-cus Obiit  
ix Aug.  
Anno M  
DCLXII

*Translation*

Here lies an honourable (man), Marcus Pantaleone, a Catholic.  
Died August 9, 1672.

Next comes a tomb with a very brief epitaph.

## XXVI

Janne  
de  
Roya  
1659.

The next grave in chronological order is that of a priest of the Society of Jesus. The Portuguese Augustinians

were the first Western order to arrive in Isfahān, Antonio de Govea, of this order, having been sent as an ambassador to Shāh 'Abbās the Great, in 1598, by Aleixas de Menesez, Archbishop of Goa. They were followed by the Carmelites, who came as ambassadors, in 1604, from Pope Clement VIII to the same Shāh. They were followed by the Capuchins. These three orders were lodged in the city, but the Jesuits, who came later as missionaries, never succeeded in obtaining this privilege, and were established in Julfa.

## XXVII

Hic iacet P.  
Alexander  
de Rhodes  
Gall<sup>s</sup> Sacer-  
-dos Religios<sup>s</sup>  
e Societate  
Jesu, Missiona-  
-ri<sup>s</sup> Aplieus qui  
post longos  
pro X<sup>ro</sup> variis  
in missionib<sup>s</sup> oriē-  
-tis exātlatos  
labores per an-  
-nos 40 prim<sup>s</sup> hic  
e sociis pie obi-  
-it die 5 Nov. an-  
-no Salutis 1660  
aetatis suae 68  
I. H. S.

*Translation*

Here lies Father Alexander de Rhodes, a Frenchman, a priest and a religious of the Society of Jesus, an apostolical missionary who, after labouring long for Christ, during a period of forty years, in various missions in the East, was the first of his companions to die here, and died piously on November 5, in the year of salvation 1660, and of his age the 68th.

Next in time comes the grave of another Frenchman.

## XXVIII

Hic iacet

Micael Mesbrun Gall<sup>s</sup>

Catholicus

29 Novem. 1660.

Multinodis fortuna modis mea tempora rexit,  
 Natus eram dives, pelago mercator amisi;  
 Plurima post opifex, addictus quaerere victum,  
 Persidis ingressu forsans sors sorte carebat  
 Qua rursus mutarer open mors attulit, aura  
 Sic paleas agitat, donec cessante quiescant.

*Translation*

Here lies Michael Mesbrun, a Frenchman and a Catholic.  
 November 29, 1660.

Fortune in fickle mood did guide my lot,  
 Dowered me with wealth, which the sea bore away.  
 Later, a craftsman, doomed to seek my bread,  
 I came to Persia's shore in evil hour;  
 For, as I strove my fortunes to restore,  
 Death cut me off. Thus are we mortals whirled  
 Like chaff before the wind, which falls at length,  
 Leaving us, as it dies, in peace, at rest.

The next tomb is that of a Capuchin. The Capuchins were highly favoured at Işfahān when the Şafavī dynasty flourished. The Carmelites and the Augustinians were accommodated in the city in houses belonging to the *Shāh*, and *Shāh Şafī* (1629-42) made a similar offer to the Capuchins when they came to Persia early in his reign, with letters of recommendation from the King of France and his minister, Cardinal Richelieu, but Father Joseph, the leader of the mission, preferred to build, at the expense of the Order, a house which should be its own property, and was permitted to do so. The establishment included a church and rooms for the monks.

## XXIX

Hic iacet R. Pater  
 Valentin<sup>s</sup> Dangers  
 Capucin. Missionis 33  
 Aetatis 66 Obiit 5 Novemb. 1665.

*Translation*

Here lies the Reverend Father Valentine Dangers, for thirty-three years a member of the Capuchin Mission : died November 5, 1665, in the 66th year of his age.

There are three graves of members of a French family named Muzen, the first of which bears the following epitaph :—

## XXX

Cy git  
 M. Claude Muzen  
 Catholique  
 François de nation  
 1668.

*Translation*

Here lies Monsieur Claude Muzen, a Catholic, a Frenchman by nation. 1668.

## XXXI

Cy git Marguerite Muzen  
 Qui fut fille et femme d'estranger  
 Qui est sortie au plus beau de son âge,  
 Qui fut fille de Claude et femme de Granger,  
 Qui eut après sa vie cette tombe en partage.  
 Déc. le 15 May, 1680.

*Translation*

Here lies Marguerite Muzen, who was the daughter of a foreigner and the wife of a foreigner, who departed from this life in the prime of her life, who was the daughter of Claude and the wife of Granger, and who had, after her death, this tomb in portionment. Died May 15, 1680.

From this epitaph it would appear that Marguerite Muzen's mother was an Armenian, a native of Persia, who



married a foreigner, the Frenchman, Claude Muzen, and whose daughter by him, Marguerite, married another foreigner, named Granger.

The third tomb of this family is that of an infant, probably the daughter of Claude Muzen.

## XXXII



Cy gît

Innocence

Muzen

*Translation*

Here lies Innocence Muzen.

A French family named de l'Estoile seems to have been domiciled in Isfahān in the latter half of the seventeenth century and, from the dates of their epitaphs, to have remained in Persia for many years.

## XXXIII

Hic iacet honorabilis homo Isac [sic] Boutet de l'Estoile  
cunctis benefic<sup>s</sup> hospitalitate Celeberrim<sup>s</sup> Catholic<sup>s</sup> natione Gall<sup>s</sup>.  
Obiit aetatis suae 76 anno 1667 Jullii 28.

*Translation*

Here lies an honourable man, Isaac Boutet de l'Estoile, generous in his hospitality to all, a noted Catholic, a Frenchman by nation. Died, in the seventy-sixth year of his age, July 28, 1667.

The following epitaph is probably that of the wife of Isaac Boutet de l'Estoile.

## XXXIV

Hic iacet

Maria

de

l'Estoile

obiit

1655

*Translation*

Here lies Maria de l'Estoile. Died 1655.

The next may be that of a second wife, or more probably a daughter, of Isaac.

XXXV  
Hic iacet  
Maria de  
l'Estoile  
Obiit 2 Xber  
1668.

*Translation*

Here lies Maria de l'Estoile. Died December 2, 1668.

The following six epitaphs are evidently those of the children of Isaac Boutet de l'Estoile.

XXXVI  
Marcus  
de  
l'Estoile  
[No date.]

XXXVII  
Laurens  
de  
l'Estoile  
[No date.]

XXXVIII  
Alexandre  
de l'Estoile  
1666

XXXIX  
Hic ia-  
-cet Ca-  
-terine  
de l'Es-  
-toille [*sic*]  
Obiit 2 Xber, 1671.

*Translation*

Here lies Catherine de l'Estoile. Died December 2, 1671.

## XL



Louis Guilherme  
de l'Étoile [*sic*]  
Décédé le  
16 Juin, 1701

*Translation*

Louis Guilherme de l'Étoile. Died June 16, 1701.

## XLI

Hic iacet D.  
Andre  
de l'Étoi-  
-le Fide Cat-  
-hol. xxi Dec.  
1745. Requi-  
-esc<sup>t</sup> in pace.

*Translation*

Here lies Monsieur André de l'Etoile, in faith a Catholic.  
December 21, 1745. May he rest in peace.

The next tomb is that of another Frenchman.

## XLII

Cy gît  
M. Jean Bernard  
Catholique  
François de  
nation. 1671.

*Translation*

Here lies Monsieur Jean Bernard, a Catholic, a Frenchman  
by nation. 1671.

In the next two graves are buried a Portuguese and  
his wife.

## XLIII

Hic iacet  
D. Manuel Rodr-  
-iguez Lusitan<sup>s</sup>  
Catholi<sup>s</sup>. Obiit  
14 Janu. 1673.

*Translation*

Here lies Dom Manuel Rodriguez, a Portuguese and a Catholic.  
Died January 14, 1673.

## XLIV

✠  
Hic  
iacet  
Ignatia Cath. uxor Manuelis  
Rodriguez  
Obi. 28 Jul. 1681.

*Translation*

Here lies Ignatia Catherine (or perhaps "a Catholic"), wife  
of Manuel Rodriguez. Died July 28, 1681.

Another Jesuit, bearing the same name as the heroic  
Belgian Cardinal, is buried in this neighbourhood.

## XLV

Hic iacet  
R. P. Cl. I. C. Mercier, e Soc. Jes.  
Ob. An. D. 1674  
Aet. 31.

*Translation*

Here lies the Reverend Father, the Cleric, J. C. Mercier, of the  
Society of Jesus. Died A.D. 1674, aged 31.

The next epitaph is extremely ill-cut by an ignorant  
mason, and ill-spelt, and much of it is illegible. Letters  
which are indecipherable are marked with asterisks.

## XLVI

Patris Da-  
 -nionis Po-  
 -mmare \* \*  
 -aris c \* er  
 ch heo ini co-  
 -rpus in hac p-  
 \* \* ea iacet.  
 Obiit anno 1661.

*Translation*

The body of Father Danio Pommare \* \* \* lies in this \* \* \*  
 Died in 1661.

The letters *ini* are perhaps the termination of *Capucini*,  
 but, if so, the rest of the word is extraordinarily corrupt.

The next epitaph was not quite so illegible, but was not  
 easy to decipher. Its latinity is corrupt, but its meaning  
 is clear.

## XLVII

Hic iacet  
 Io. Bapt.  
 Casmon  
 Mis. Apos.  
 qui cum  
 vix Spah.  
 usque pe-  
 -rvenisset  
 cum D. D.  
 Piquet  
 Babil. Epō.  
 obiit an.  
 1682  
 D. Piquet  
 ob. Hama-  
 -dani 26  
 Aug. 1685.

*Translation*

Here lies John Baptist Casmon, an apostolic missionary,  
 who, when he had hardly reached Isfahān with Monseigneur

D. Piquet, Bishop of Babylon, died in 1682. Monseigneur Piquet died at Hamadan, August 26, 1685.

The Latin Bishop of Babylon was a suffragan of the Bishop in Isfahān. Chardin, in his description of Isfahān, tells the following story of another Bishop of Babylon: "Et puis on rencontre deux grandes galleries, vis-à-vis desquelles est une maison que les Europeans appellent par dérision l'Evêché, parce qu'elle a appartenu ces années passées à un Evêque de Babylone, suffragant à l'Evêché d'Ispahan, qui y a demeuré quelque tems. C'étoit un Carme François, nommé Monseigneur Bernard, qui après avoir demeuré quelque tems en cette ville sans trouver de quoi occuper un Evêque, se retira et retourna en France, laissant la maison en bon état, l'église, la bibliothèque, les ornemens, et l'argenterie. Etant à Paris, il vendit tout cela à un orfèvre, qui le fit revendre par les Hollandois l'an 1669. On vendit la maison cinq-mille francs, l'argenterie deux-mille, le reste fut partie renvoié, partie dissipé."

The next tomb, in point of time, to that of Father Casmon is that of a child.

#### XLVIII

Hic iacet Maria Robin.

In coelum abiit 20 Oct. An. 1683

Aet. 3.

Sic

Consummata brevi complevit tempo-  
-ra multa.

#### *Translation*

Here lies Mary Robin, who went to heaven October 20, 1683, aged three. Thus, in a short time she lived much.

Next comes the tomb of a Swiss clockmaker, bearing a name sufficiently well known.

## XLIX

Hic iacet insig-  
 -nis Dñs Jacob Ro-  
 -usseau Genevens-  
 -is horologior-  
 -um faber vixit  
 annos 74 Spahani  
 48. Obiit 29 Mar-  
 -tii, 1753.

*Translation*

Here lies the famous Monsieur Jacob (or Jacques) Rousseau, of Geneva, a clockmaker. He lived for 74 years, 48 at Işfahān. Died March 29, 1753.

The art of making clocks and watches was, as Chardin says, unknown to the Persians, but the Shāh employed, in his time, a few European clock- and watchmakers.

After the downfall of the Šafavī dynasty the glory of Işfahān faded. Christians and foreigners no longer enjoyed the favour and protection of comparatively enlightened sovereigns, and the city ceased to be a desirable place of residence for them. M. Rousseau, however, long outlived the dynasty at Işfahān, but the next European epitaph, in point of time, bears a date nearly a century later than his.

## L



Ci gît Xavier Hommair Hell  
 Français, mort à Hispahan  
 1848, Août 18.

*Translation*

Here lies Xavier Hommair Hell, a Frenchman. Died at Işfahān, August 18, 1848.

The next epitaph of interest is that of an Armenian who may, however, be regarded as a foreigner, for he came from abroad as a missionary.

## LI

(Armenian epitaph.)

Ci gît

le R. D. J. Derderian

qui renouvela

et fit prospérer

la mission

catholique

abandonnée

depuis longtemps.

Après

24 ans

de travaux apostoliques

il mourut

en odeur de sainteté

le 27 Sept. 1852.

*Translation*

Here lies the Reverend D. J. Terterian, who restored and made to flourish the Catholic mission, long abandoned. After twenty-four years of apostolic labours he died in the odour of sanctity September 27, 1852.

There are a few other graves of foreign Christians, not Europeans, but in obedience to the Western Church. One is that of a Georgian lady.

## LII

Hic iacet

Christiana

Virgo

Sara nomine

natione

Georgiana

fide

Catholica

quae cum

per multos

annos

pietate



toti populo  
 praeluxisset  
 ad Eum  
 quem toto  
 corde  
 dilexerat  
 avolavit,  
 xxiii Jan.  
 An° Domini  
 MDCCIV.

*Translation*

Here lies a Christian virgin named Sara, a Georgian by nation and a Catholic by religion, who, after she had for many years borne the light of piety before the whole people, on January 23, A.D. 1704, took flight to Him whom she had loved with her whole heart.

There are several graves of Chaldæan Christians of the Roman obedience.

LIII  
 Hic iacet  
 Dominicus  
 Babilonens-  
 -is religione  
 Romanus pr-  
 -ofessione me-  
 -rcator. Obiit  
 Anno D. 1639.

*Translation*

Here lies Dominic, a Babylonian, by religion a Roman and by profession a merchant. Died A.D. 1639.

LIV  
 Hic iacet  
 Ebrahim  
 Babilonen  
 1649

*Translation*

Here lies Ebrahim, a Babylonian, 1649,

## LV

Hic iacet  
matrona  
Babilonensis  
Christiana Ro.  
nomine Lucia.  
Obiit 18 Jan. 1659.

*Translation*

Here lies a Babylonian matron, a Roman Christian, named Lucia. Died January 18, 1659.

There are three graves of a family named Ioverida, perhaps of a husband and wife and their son, probably Chaldæans.

## LVI

Hic iacet  
Abdallah  
Ioverida Re-  
-ligione Ca-  
-tholicus.  
Obiit xvii Jan.  
Anno 1664.

*Translation*

Here lies 'Abdallah Ioverida, a Catholic by religion, died January 17, 1664.

## LVII

Hic iacet An-  
-na Ioverida  
religione Ca-  
-tholica quae  
obiit xxi Dec.  
anno 1668.

*Translation*

Here lies Anna Ioverida, by religion a Catholic, who died December 21, 1668.

## LVIII

Hic  
iacet  
Georgi<sup>a</sup>  
Ioveri-  
-da Ca-  
-thol<sup>a</sup>  
obiit  
1681.

*Translation*

Here lies Georgo Ioverida, a Catholic, died 1681.

## LIX

Hic iacet  
Pericã  
Religiõ  
Cathol<sup>a</sup>  
Obiit  
9 Maii  
1666

*Translation*

Here lies Perican, a Catholic by religion. Died May 9, 1666.

The next epitaph is that of a Chaldæan lady who was evidently, by her name, married to a Spaniard or a Portuguese.

## LX

Hic iacet Signora Maria Gomez  
natione Babiloniensis religione  
Romana. Plenis annis 77 obiit  
27 Augusti, 1664.

*Translation*

Here lies Signora Maria Gomez, a Babylonian by nation, a Roman by religion. Died, at the full age of 77, Aug. 27, 1664.

The lady buried in the next tomb was probably a Chaldæan married to an Armenian.

## LXI

Hic iacet

D<sup>a</sup> ClaraVaren D<sup>i</sup>

Niersi con-

-sors. Ob. 2<sup>o</sup>

Julii 1737

etae sue 40.

*Translation*

Here lies Mme. Clara Varen, wife of M. Nerses. Died July 2, 1737, in the 40th year of her age.

The last tombs to be noticed are three of a family of Christian Arabs, bearing the name of Sa'id. Chardin mentions the interpreter of the Dutch East India Company, buried in the first of the three graves, as an Arab who had lived long in Europe and had a great talent for languages, though he did not understand English.

## LXII

Hic iacet

Dñs. David Sahid olim Regis Galliae per

6 an. postea Soc. Hollandicae per 34 an<sup>a</sup>linguarum interpres peritissim<sup>a</sup> ac religio[ne]Catho<sup>a</sup> zelo clarissim<sup>a</sup>. Ob. 10 Dec. An. 1684 aet. 72.*Translation*

Here lies M. David Sa'id, formerly for six years in the service of the King of France and afterwards for thirty-four in that of the Dutch Company as a most skilled interpreter of tongues; and distinguished by his zeal for the Catholic religion. Died December 10, 1684, aged 72.

## LXIII

(Armenian inscription.)

Hic

iacet Dom.

Helena Sa-

-hid ob-

1730, 16 Nov.

*Translation*

Here lies the lady Helena Sa'id. Died November 16, 1730.

LXIV

Simon

Said

Catholic.

(No date.)

## XII

### SAGARA AND THE HAIHAYAS, VASISTHA AND AURVA

By F. E. PARGITER

IN two papers published in this Journal<sup>1</sup> I dealt with the stories about the first Vasiṣṭha, who is famous in historical tradition. He flourished during the reigns of three kings of Ayodhyā, Trayyārūpa, Satyavrata Trisanku and Hariścandra, and his personal name was Devarāj. This paper deals with the next great Vasiṣṭha, who lived in the reign of a later king, Sagara. Those papers brought the Ayodhyā genealogy down to Hariścandra and his son Rohita. The next portion of the genealogy is given thus by five Puranas,<sup>2</sup> which agree generally, and the collated text runs thus, immaterial variations being omitted :—

Harito Rohitasyātha Cañcur<sup>3</sup> Hārita ucyate  
 Vijayaś ca Sudevaś<sup>4</sup> ca Cañcu-putrau babhūvatuḥ  
 jetā kṣatrasya sarvasya Vijayas tena sa smṛtaḥ  
 Rurukas<sup>5</sup> tauayas tasya rājā dharmārtha-kovidāḥ  
 Rurukasya Vṛkaḥ<sup>6</sup> putras tasmād Bāhus tu jajñivān.

The Viṣṇu and the Saura Upapurana give the same genealogy, the Garuḍa agrees omitting Sudeva, and the late Bhāgavata is somewhat similar.<sup>7</sup> The other Puranas

<sup>1</sup> JRAS, 1913, p. 885 ; 1917, p. 37.

<sup>2</sup> Brahmāṇḍa iii, 63, 117-19 : Vāyu 38, 119-21 : Brahma 8, 26-8 : Hariv. 13, 756-60 : Liṅga i, 66, 12-14.

<sup>3</sup> Liṅga calls him *Dhundhu*.

<sup>4</sup> Liṅga *Sutejās*. Brahma omits him and modifies the following words accordingly.

<sup>5</sup> Liṅga calls him *Rucaka*.

<sup>6</sup> Vāyu *Rurukād Dhṛtakah*.

<sup>7</sup> Viṣṇu iv, 3, 15 in prose. Saura 30, 37-8, calling Cañcu *Dhundhu* and Ruruka *Kuruka*. Garuḍa 138, 27-8. Bhāgav. ix, 8, 1-2, which calls Cañcu *Campa* (attributing to him erroneously the founding of the city Campā), makes Sudeva and Vijaya father and son, and calls Ruruka *Bharuka*.

condense it by omitting all between Rohita and Vṛka, so making Vṛka Rohita's son, but the variations in the Kūrma MSS. show that this curtailed version is due merely to the omission of little-known kings.<sup>1</sup> The Rānāyaṇa version will be noticed separately.

Bāhu's son was Sagara as all the authorities say.<sup>2</sup> The Brahmāṇḍa, Vāyu, Brahma, Harivaṃśa and Śiva give first a brief account of them,<sup>3</sup> and then narrate their story at length in a kṣatriya ballad, wherein they all agree closely.<sup>4</sup> The Viṣṇu tells the same story in prose, amplifying it in details.<sup>5</sup> All these are narrated in the course of the genealogy. The Padma gives the ballad in a later and shorter form, with variations, as a separate story.<sup>6</sup> The Vṛhannāradiya expands the Viṣṇu account into a long versified tale with much moralising.<sup>7</sup> The fullest account is given by the Brahmāṇḍa in another passage, which, though greatly amplified after the fashion of a later time, yet appears to embody genuine tradition about Sagara.<sup>8</sup> The Bhāgavata notices the story very briefly in late form.<sup>9</sup> The other Puranas merely say Bāhu's son was Sagara and give no account.<sup>10</sup>

The kṣatriya ballad in the five Puranas mentioned is the most trustworthy account. They are all obviously based

<sup>1</sup> Matsya 12, 38 : Padma v, 8, 143 ; and vi, 21, 11. Śiva vii, 61, 22. Agni 272, 27. Kūrma i, 21, 3, of which one copy has all the above lines except the third, calling Cañcu *Dhṛundhu* and Ruruka *Kāruka*.

<sup>2</sup> But Padma vi, 21, 11-14, which calls Bāhu *Subāhu*, perverts the mention of *gara*, "poison," in the ballad, and says his son was Gara, who being menaced by his enemies found refuge at Bhārgava's hermitage, and there Sagara was born as his son.

<sup>3</sup> Brahmāṇḍa iii, 63, 120-4 : Vāyu 88, 122-5 : Brahma 8, 29-32 : Hariv. 13, 760-4 : Śiva vii, 61, 23-5 : which are almost identical.

<sup>4</sup> Brahmāṇḍa iii, 63, 126-41 : Vāyu 88, 127-43 : Brahma 8, 35-51 : Hariv. 14, 767-84 : Śiva vii, 61, 29-43 : which are largely identical.

<sup>5</sup> Viṣṇu iv, 3, 15-21.

<sup>6</sup> Padma vi, 21, 19-33.

<sup>7</sup> Vṛhannāradiya 7, 7-8, 63.

<sup>8</sup> Brahmāṇḍa iii, 47, 74-48, 49 ; and 49, 38-57.

<sup>9</sup> Bhāgav. ix, 8, 2-7.

<sup>10</sup> Matsya 12, 39 : Padma v, 8, 143 : Kūrma i, 21, 4 : Liṅga i, 66, 14 : Garuḍa 138, 28 : Agni 272, 27 : Saura 30, 39.

on one original, yet fall into two versions. The Brahmanāṇḍa and Vāyu are almost identical, and have the best text. The Brahma and Harivaṁśa are practically identical, curtailing the former account in some verses and adding a little in others. The Śiva agrees generally with the two latter, but is briefer. The late Padma version has elaborated the brahmanical features of Sāgara's education.

The story runs thus. Bāhu was ill, and the Haihayas, Tālajaṅghas<sup>1</sup> and Śakas uniting wrested his kingdom from him. Yavanas, Pāradas, Kāmbojas, Pahlavas and Śakas, these five tribes<sup>2</sup> aided the Haihayas and attacked him. These lordly kṣatriyas<sup>3</sup> were stronger and seized his kingdom. Bāhu abandoned his capital, entered the forest, and with his queen practised austerities. He died there through old age and weakness. His queen, a Yādava princess, followed him, and her co-wife gave her poison in order to destroy her future child. She made a funeral pile and placed Bāhu's body on the fire.<sup>4</sup>

<sup>1</sup> The Tālajaṅghas were the chief branch of the Haihayas, who were one of the two great branches of the Yādavas, see JRAS., 1914, p. 274.

<sup>2</sup> *Gaṇa*. Notwithstanding Dr. Thomas' dissent (JRAS, 1916, p. 162) I cannot but translate *gaṇa* as "tribe". *Pañca gaṇāḥ* is applied here in these Puranas to these five peoples, signifying (1) that each constituted a distinct *gaṇa*, so that each *gaṇa* consisted of one nationality, and (2) that each *gaṇa* was not a community, but an armed host. *Gaṇa* is a very common word in the Puranas and means a "homogeneous group", the particular kind of homogeneity implied depending on the context. Applied to peoples here, it implies racial homogeneity, and means a "tribe" in the ordinary use of the word. Its meaning "homogeneous group" fitted it excellently as a plural termination, such as it became in later times; and indeed its force is often in the Puranas virtually nothing more. In the expression *Jahnu-gaṇā* (JRAS, 1913, p. 888, n. 1) it means a "group descended from Jahnu", or is virtually a plural "the Jahnus". Kālidāsa's expression *pārvatīyair gaṇair* (*id.*, 1915, p. 804) means (I may point out) just what every Indian Administration knows as "hill tribes".

<sup>3</sup> *Kṣatriya-puṅgava*.

<sup>4</sup> So the Vāyu and Brahmanāṇḍa. The later Brahma and Harivaṁśa say she ascended the funeral pile, evidently to immolate herself, and Aurva dissuaded her. The Viṣṇu and Vṛhannāradiya, later still, say so explicitly.



Aurva Bhārgava, taking compassion on her, brought her to his hermitage. She gave birth to a son bearing marks of the poison, named Sagara.<sup>1</sup> Aurva brought him up, taught him the Vedas, and bestowed on him Rāma Jāmadagnya's terrible fire-weapon.<sup>2</sup> Sagara collected an army, and with that weapon slew the Haihayas in battle. He determined to exterminate the Śakas, Yavanas, Kāmbojas, Pāradas, and Pahlavas. When he was slaughtering them they fled to Vasiṣṭha for protection. That great muni made a compact with them, stopped Sagara and saved them; but Sagara destroyed their laws of religion and changed their mode of dress. He made the Śakas shave half the head, the Yavanas and Kāmbojas shave the whole head, the Pāradas wear their hair loose, and the Pahlavas grow beards. He deprived them of the recitation of the Veda and the exclamation *vaṣaṭ*. These five tribes and also the Kolisarpas, Māhiṣikas, Dārvas, Colas and Khasas were all kṣatriya tribes. Sagara of yore annulled their religion according to Vasiṣṭha's word.

The Rāmāyaṇa, which gives the general genealogy incorrectly,<sup>3</sup> calls Bāhu *Asita* and narrates the story twice.<sup>4</sup> The two passages are largely the same, but the second alters the order of some of the lines and is inferior. They agree with the ballad in certain expressions and give much the same story, but are shorter, and make a serious anachronism in calling the Bhārgava rishi Cyavana, because Cyavana was one of the progenitors of the Bhārgavas, an ancestor of the Aurvas, and belonged to a period far more ancient. Moreover, they narrate the

<sup>1</sup> That is, *sa-gara*: but the story of the second wife and the poison appears rather to have been invented to explain the name. Brahmāṇḍa iii, 47, 78 mentions only one queen.

<sup>2</sup> Hence the destruction of the Tālajaṅghas is attributed to Aurva, Mahābhārata, xiii, 153, 7223.

<sup>3</sup> JRAS, 1910, pp. 17-18.

<sup>4</sup> Rāmāy. i, 70, 28-37; ii, 110, 15-24.

story only till the birth of Sagara, and make no mention therein of Śakas, Yavanas, Kāmbojas, Pāradas and Pahlavas, but instead couple with the Haihayas and Tālajaṅghas, the Śūras and the Śasabindus. The Śūras were a subdivision of the Haihayas,<sup>1</sup> and the Śasabindus were the descendants of Śasabindu, king of the other branch of the Yādavas, specially styled the Yādavas.<sup>2</sup> The Śūras would naturally have been among the Haihayas, and the Śasabindus might have been their allies. The Rāmāyaṇa version does not throw any light on the questions discussed here, and need not therefore be set out.

The historical and political aspect, in tradition, of the great struggle described here has been pointed out before<sup>3</sup>; and I propose now to consider three subjects in connexion with Sagara, namely, the five foreign tribes, Vasiṣṭha and the name Aurva.

From the time when Bāhu was driven from Ayodhyā till Sagara recovered it some twenty or more probably twenty-five years must be allowed, and during that interval the capital and country were subjugated by the invaders. The Haihayas, whose capital was Māhiṣmatī (the modern Mandhata) on the River Narbada,<sup>4</sup> did not apparently found kingdoms in the regions they overran, but made continual raids as the Marathas did in modern times. The bands of Śakas, Yavanas, Kāmbojas, Pāradas and Pahlavas, however, who had come from the extreme north-west, evidently remained and settled down. Sagara conquered and drove out the Haihayas,<sup>5</sup> but these foreign bands, so far from attempting to flee homeward, remained

<sup>1</sup> Brahmāṇḍa iii, 69, 50 : Vāyu 94, 49 : Brāhma 13, 200 : Hariv. 34, 1892.

<sup>2</sup> JRAS, 1914, p. 274.

<sup>3</sup> JRAS, 1910, pp. 9, 10 ; 1914, pp. 280-1.

<sup>4</sup> *Id.* 1910, p. 36 ; 1914, p. 278.

<sup>5</sup> Also MBh. iii, 106, 8832. He is highly extolled in *id.* xii, 29, 1023-8.

and sought protection from Vasiṣṭha. He succoured them and they continued subjects of Sagara under degrading disabilities. The tribes here mentioned are the bands of them which invaded Ayodhyā, and not the main tribes which dwelt outside India. During the interval the Aikṣvāku kṣatriyas were subdued, but the religious conditions do not seem to have been affected as will be shown, and thus the great Vasiṣṭha family, the hereditary priests of Ayodhyā, evidently maintained its priestly position, so that Vasiṣṭha could interpose with authority between Sagara and the foreign bands. Sagara altered their personal appearance, and his changes are noteworthy as seemingly implying that their appearance was the opposite before. They remained in his kingdom and would naturally have become gradually assimilated to the rest of the people, so that the degrading distinctions disappeared in the course of time.

A very remarkable feature in the narrative is this, that the five tribes are not spoken of as mlecchas or barbarians, but are styled kṣatriyas, and so also are the Kolisarpas, Māhiṣikas, Dārvas, Colas, and Khasas. The Māhiṣikas were apparently the people of Māhiṣmatī. The Dārvas and Khasas were tribes from the extreme north-west. The Colas were not, it seems, the Colas of South India,<sup>1</sup> but rather another frontier tribe whose name appears as Culikas or Cūlikas in later times.<sup>2</sup> Who the Kolisarpas were it is impossible to say, especially as the different readings of the name suggest that it is corrupt.

Further there is no suggestion that the Śakas and four other tribes were different in religion from the people of Ayodhyā. The statement that Sagara deprived them of the recitation of the sacred texts and the benefit of

<sup>1</sup> The Brahma and Hariv., misunderstanding them as such, join Keralas with them instead of Khasas. The Colas and Keralas did not apparently exist then as such.

<sup>2</sup> JRAS, 1912, p. 712.

the sacred exclamation *vaṣaṭ* manifestly refers to the brahmanic religion<sup>1</sup> and implies that they had possessed these privileges before. Moreover, they appealed to Vasiṣṭha as if they had some claim to his protection. It seems therefore that they were not markedly different in religion from Vasiṣṭha and Sagara. Had they been of different religion, Vasiṣṭha could hardly have maintained his position during their ascendancy, they would have had no ground for claiming his succour, nor he any particular reason for so promptly saving them. It is not likely that they were of alien worship when they invaded Ayodhyā, and became converted to the brahmanic religion, because they were the conquerors and the interval was too short. The Bhāgavata, which is a very late and sectarian Purana, recasts the story significantly. It says that Sagara did not kill them, adds Barbaras to them, and mentions, in general words only, the personal restrictions he imposed, but makes no reference to the awkward religious statements.

The ballad thus implies that these five foreign tribes were kṣatriyas and of much the same religion as Vasiṣṭha and Sagara. These two features throw light on the age of the ballad. Contingents from these tribes took part long afterwards in the great Bhārata battle,<sup>2</sup> apparently chiefly in the army of the Kāmboja king.<sup>3</sup> They are sometimes spoken of in fair terms in the Mahābhārata,<sup>4</sup> but nowhere as of noble rank at the time of that battle, as far as I am aware. They fell steadily in Indian estimation in after times. It is said Śakas, Yavanas and Kāmbojas were of kṣatriya origin and became

<sup>1</sup> The Bralmāṇḍa iii, 48, 45 says Sagara deprived them of Vedic rites and the aid of brahmans—emphasizing the position.

<sup>2</sup> MBh. v, 196, 7609; vi, 56, 2408; vii, 20, 798-801.

<sup>3</sup> *Id.* v, 18, 590; 165, 5748-50: vii, 7, 182.

<sup>4</sup> *Id.* i, 67, 2668; 186, 6995: v, 3, 78, 81; 159, 5510: viii, 45, 2107: xii, 101, 3737.

*vr̥ṣalas* from not seeing brahmans.<sup>1</sup> The five tribes are often classed with Barbaras,<sup>2</sup> with Ābhīras, Kirātas and other tribes, and with mlecchas.<sup>3</sup> Śakas, Yavanas and Pahlavas, and other low tribes are reckoned mlecchas.<sup>4</sup> As brahmanic influence gradually waned in the north-west after that battle, the Panjab nations also became tainted in Indian opinion. Thus Yavanas, Śakas, Pahlavas, and Kāmbojas, with Barbaras and other rude tribes, and some of the Panjab races are spoken of disparagingly.<sup>5</sup> They and some Panjab tribes were pronounced wicked, men of evil customs, and mlecchas.<sup>6</sup> The ultimate opinion entertained by the people of Madhyadeśa about the Panjab peoples is expressed in the vulgar tirade against the Madras put into Karna's mouth,<sup>7</sup> in which the Madras, Gāndhāras, Sindhus and Sauvīras,<sup>8</sup> and indeed all the Panjab races are unsparingly reprobated.<sup>9</sup> When the Panjab was so regarded, these five outer nations could not have fared better, and such is stated.<sup>10</sup>

The first passage quoted above acknowledges that when Sagara conquered them the Śakas, Yavanas and Kāmbojas were kṣatriyas and had the ministrations of brahmans, and the references to them in the Mahābhārata imply that they were hardly still in that condition at the later time of the great battle. Its significance might be discounted by the fact that it adds (xiii, 33, 2104-5) the same remark about Drāviḍas, Kalindas (Kaliṅgas?), Pulindas and

<sup>1</sup> *Id.* xiii, 33, 2103.

<sup>2</sup> *Id.* ii, 29, 1088; 31, 1199; 50, 1843; iii, 253, 15254.

<sup>3</sup> *Id.* ii, 31, 1199; 50, 1832, 1834, 1850; 51, 1990-1; iii, 188, 12838-40; ix, 2, 74; xii, 207, 7560.

<sup>4</sup> *Id.* i, 175, 6683-6.

<sup>5</sup> *Id.* iii, 51, 1988-91; xii, 65, 2429-31.

<sup>6</sup> *Id.* xii, 207, 7560-1; vii, 93, 3379-81.

<sup>7</sup> *Id.* viii, 40, 1836-58; 44, 2028, to 45, 2110.

<sup>8</sup> *Id.* viii, 40, 1845, 1857-8, 1861.

<sup>9</sup> *Id.* viii, 44, 2030, 2054-6, 2063-5, 2070; 45, 2086, 2099-2100, 2109-2110. Cf. v. 38, 1525.

<sup>10</sup> *Id.* iii, 188, 12838-40.

Kolisarpas, as well as about Uśīnaras and Māhiṣakas, who were undoubtedly kṣatriyas: but, whatever may be the explanation regarding all these, the remarkable fact here is that this ballad portrays the Śakas, Yavanas and Kāmbojas actually as kṣatriyas and as having brahmanic ministrations, that is, as being actually in a condition which did not apparently exist later at the time of that battle, and certainly not at any still later time according to Indian opinion. The ballad could not therefore have been composed in after times, as the Bhāgavata version shows itself to have been. It is therefore really ancient, dating back to a period earlier than that battle.

It is not necessary to enquire what was the racial position of the tribes mentioned. Śakas certainly were not Aryans by origin, even if the others were. How then could these invading bands of Śakas and others be regarded as kṣatriyas possessing brahmanical privileges? The statement made in Indian tradition, that the Druhyus of Gāndhāra spread out to the north and other regions beyond, and founded kingdoms among the mleccha countries there,<sup>1</sup> supplies an explanation. Those Druhyu offshoots would naturally have established a kṣatriya class in the tribes which they ruled over, and have introduced their brahmanic religion there. These bands probably came from such kingdoms: they would thus have been kṣatriyas and of the same religion as the people of North India, and, as Druhyus, might naturally have joined to help the Haihayas (who were descendants of Yadu), as the ballad says.

<sup>1</sup> Brahmaṇḍa iii, 74, 11-12; Vāyu 99, 11-12; Matsya 48, 9 (which agree) say of Pracetas, the last king named in the Druhyu genealogy:—

Pracetasaḥ putra-śataṁ rājānaḥ sarva eva te  
mleccha-rāṣṭrādhipāḥ sarve hy udicīṁ dīśaṁ āsthitaḥ.

Bhāgav. ix, 23, 15-16 says the same briefly. Viṣṇu iv, 17, 2 is fuller—Pracetasaḥ putra-śataṁ adharmabahuḥlānāṁ mlecchānāṁ udicīyādīnāṁ ādhipatyam akarot. Agni 276, 5 merely says Pracetas had a hundred sons. The other Puranas do not notice this.

As Sagara was the eighth king after Hariścandra, this Vasiṣṭha cannot be Devarāj, who was already of mature age in Hariścandra's reign, and would be several descents lower, even if the kings had very short reigns. None of the accounts give him any definite name, except the long story in the Brahmanāṇḍa and the account in the Vṛhannāradiya. The former (iii, 49, 43) calls him Āpava incidentally. This, however, is a patronymic, for there was an earlier Āpava Vasiṣṭha, who lived in the reign of the great Haihaya king Arjuna Kārtavīrya, who was father of Tālajaṅgha, the ancestor of the Tālajaṅghas. Arjuna reigned at Māhiṣmatī, and in his conquests northward burnt the empty hermitage of Āpava Vasiṣṭha, son of Varuṇa (Vasiṣṭha), and Āpava cursed him.<sup>1</sup> Āpava is said to be a patronymic from *āpu*, which is supposed to be equivalent to Varuṇa,<sup>2</sup> and that is possible because he is called Vāruṇi.<sup>3</sup> The first Āpava Vasiṣṭha was a contemporary of Arjuna Kārtavīrya,<sup>4</sup> and Āpava Vasiṣṭha in Sagara's reign could not be he, but would be a descendant by some generations.

The Vṛhannāradiya, which appears to have noteworthy tradition, says (8, 63) that Atharvanidhi, meaning obviously Vasiṣṭha, consecrated Sagara as king, thus calling Vasiṣṭha *Atharvanidhi*. The same epithet is applied to a later Vasiṣṭha, who was priest to Sagara's

<sup>1</sup> Brahmanāṇḍa iii, 69, 42-4; Vāyu 24, 42-4; Brahma 13, 192-4; Hariv. 33, 1884-6, which are almost identical, but the first two give the older text. Mahābhārata i, 99, 3924 gives two lines; Matsya 43, 41 and Padma v, 12, 141 only one line. MBh. xii, 49, 1756-7 are similar. Brahmanāṇḍa iii, 70, 12-14, Vāyu 25, 12-13 and Matsya 44, 12-13 give a fanciful explanation.

<sup>2</sup> Monier-Williams' Dictionary.

<sup>3</sup> MBh. i, 99, 3926, 3947. Bṛhaddevatā vi, 24 and 33 know of a Vasiṣṭha Vāruṇi, though the references in the two verses are chronologically ages apart, and would imply two such Vasiṣṭhas.

<sup>4</sup> This Āpava Vasiṣṭha was thus a contemporary of Devarāj Vasiṣṭha, who has been discussed in JRAS, 1913, pp. 896-7; 1917, pp. 38-9,

eighteenth successor, king Dilīpa II, in Raghuvamśa i, 59.<sup>1</sup> Now Atharvanidhi is not necessarily a name in these two passages, because the Brahmāṇḍa calls the great primeval Bhṛgu rishi Uśanas-Śukra,<sup>2</sup> *Atharvaṇām nidhiḥ*. Yet it may well have been a name, for there was a Vasiṣṭha named Atharvan, because the Kirātārjunīya (x, 10) speaks of "the Veda in which the order of the words was arranged by Atharvan", and Mallinātha explains 'Veda' as the fourth Veda, and 'Atharvan' as Vasiṣṭha, quoting the dictum, *Atharvaṇas tu mantrōddhāro Vasiṣṭha-kṛtaḥ*. I am not aware of any tradition that throws light on that Atharvan Vasiṣṭha, but his name makes it quite probable that Atharvanidhi was also a name; and as this term is, I believe, applied only to these two Vasiṣṭhas,<sup>3</sup> Sagara's and Dilīpa's, we may, in order to distinguish them from other Vasiṣṭhas, for convenience call this Vasiṣṭha in Sagara's reign Atharvanidhi I Āpava, and Dilīpa's priest Atharvanidhi II. This proposal does not postulate too much, for there may have been two Vasiṣṭhas of the same name, just as there were two Dilīpas, two Yuvanāśvas, two Haryaśvas, and two Viśvasahas in the Ayodhyā dynasty.<sup>4</sup>

I have often drawn attention to the lack of the historical sense among brahmans, which is notorious. It produced two results; first, chronology hardly existed for them, and therefore they confused different persons of the same name; secondly, there was no real distinction between history and mythology, so that they freely mythologized incidents in traditional history. These occurrences supply illustrations of both these errors.

<sup>1</sup> It calls him also *Brahmayoni* (i, 64), but this is merely a synonym of another appellation given him, *sraṣṭuḥ sūnuḥ* (i, 93); both terms meaning the primeval mythical rishi Vasiṣṭha, with whom he is confused.

<sup>2</sup> Brahmāṇḍa iii, 30, 51-4 read with MBh. i, 76, 3188-90 and Matsya 25, 9-11.

<sup>3</sup> It is not mentioned in Böhrtlingk & Roth's nor in Monier-Williams' Dictionaries; nor in Sørensen's Index to the MBh.

<sup>4</sup> JRAS, 1910, pp. 18, 27, 29. See also p. 362, n. 3.



In the brahmanic fables of the earlier Vasiṣṭha's contest with Viśvāmitra it is said that Vasiṣṭha's cow created hordes of Pahlavas, Śakas, Yavanas and Kāmbojas, as well as Barbaras, mlecchas, Kirātas, and other rude tribes to attack Viśvāmitra.<sup>1</sup> This Vasiṣṭha's siding with the five tribes is no doubt the origin of that ridiculous detail. The brahmanas confused the two Vasiṣṭhas of Triśanku's time and Sagara's time; and, as they did not know how these foreign tribes came to be at Ayodhyā, the tribes had of course to be accounted for, so they made the tribes forsooth the creation of the wonderful brahmanic cow, and therefore created to fight Viśvāmitra; and further, being ignorant of the former condition of these tribes, they classed them with mlecchas and barbarians according to the ideas of after times. We can thus see how brahmanic fable grew; and those features proclaim those fables to be a brahmanical fabrication far later than this ballad.

The other process of mythologizing traditional history finds one of its best illustrations in "Aurva". *Aurva* is a patronymic from Ūrva. The first Aurva was apparently R̥cika,<sup>2</sup> and he was son of Ūrva.<sup>3</sup> Ūrva is mentioned in the Bhārgava vaiṣṇa<sup>4</sup> and elsewhere.<sup>5</sup> The next Aurva was R̥cika's son Jamadagni, and his son was Rāma. The Aurva here mentioned had the personal name Agni, for the genealogies go on to say that he

<sup>1</sup> Rāmāyaṇa i, 54, 18 to 55, 3. Mahābhārata i, 175, 6683-6: cf. ix, 41, 2304-5.

<sup>2</sup> Brahmāṇḍa iii, 66, 63: Vāyu 91, 92: Brahma 10, 53: Hariv. 27, 1456.

<sup>3</sup> MBh. xiii, 56, 2907-10. Vāyu 65, 91-2, where read *tŪrva* for *tārva*; Brahmāṇḍa iii, 1, 94-5 less correctly: in both *Ātmavāṇa* and *Apravāṇa* are mistakes for *Apnarāṇa*. None of these three forms is in the MBh. (see Sørensen's Index), and it curtails the genealogy in i, 66, 2609-11, and further still in xiii, 85, 4145.

<sup>4</sup> Vāyu 65, 92, which is better than Brahmāṇḍa iii, 1, 95.

<sup>5</sup> Matsya 175, 23: Padma v, 38, 74: Hariv. 46, 2527.

bestowed offspring on Sagara,<sup>1</sup> and three Puranas call him Agni,<sup>2</sup> while two others give him the synonymous names Vahni<sup>3</sup> and Tejonidhi.<sup>4</sup>

These names Aurva, Jamadagni and Agni became a fertile source of fable through misunderstandings. The story begins thus on a basis of traditional facts. The Bhārgavas were priests of the Haihaya king Kṛtavīrya and had been enriched by his munificence. After his death the Haihaya kṣatriyas coveted their wealth and, as the Bhārgavas would not relinquish it, used violence to recover it and even slaughtered the Bhārgavas. The Bhārgavas fled northward, and one of their wives bore a son then named Aurva.<sup>5</sup> Now about that time or a little earlier was born the Bhārgava Ṛcika, for he was an early contemporary of Kṛtavīrya's son, king Arjuna, since his grandson Rāma killed Arjuna.<sup>6</sup> Ṛcika was Aurva as mentioned above; so also were his son Jamadagni, his son Rāma, and this descendant Agni. Such are the traditional facts. The fable is narrated in two forms, the earlier form in the Mahābhārata<sup>7</sup> and the later in three Puranas.<sup>8</sup>

Agni means "fire" and Jamadagni "devouring fire". Rāma is said to have destroyed all kṣatriyas off the earth twenty-one times, and this is brahmanical fable, for no kṣatriya would have started a story so disgraceful to his class. Aurva was misunderstood as being derived

<sup>1</sup> Brahmanḍa iii, 63, 156 : Vāyu 88, 157 : Brahma 8, 65 : Hariv. 15, 799 : Śiva vii, 61, 53 : Agni 272, 28. But MBh. iii, 106, 8837-9 says Śiva granted him the boon.

<sup>2</sup> Matsya 12, 40 : Padma v, 8, 144 : Liṅga i, 66, 15.

<sup>3</sup> Kūrma i, 21, 5.

<sup>4</sup> Vṛhannāradya 7, 60 ; 8, 8, 9, 65.

<sup>5</sup> MBh. i, 178, 6802-15.

<sup>6</sup> JRAS, 1910, pp. 35-6 ; 1914, p. 279.

<sup>7</sup> MBh. i, 178, 6815-180, 6863 : very briefly in xiii, 56, 2905-9. The latter assigns to Ūrva the part properly assigned elsewhere to Aurva Agni.

<sup>8</sup> Matsya 175, 23-62 : Padma v, 38, 74-112 : Hariv. 46, 2527-69 ; which all have a common text.

from *ūru*, "thigh," and so taken to mean "born from the thigh". Further, into it was apparently imported a supposition that it was connected with *urvā*, "the earth," so that it meant "belonging to or existing in the earth". These remarks being premised, the fables may be given very briefly.

The Mahābhārata story given above continues thus. The son was born from his mother's thigh<sup>1</sup> and was therefore called Aurva.<sup>2</sup> He at once blinded her assailants with his splendour, and restored their sight at their prayers: but filled with wrath at the sufferings of the Bhārgavas, he determined to destroy the world. His forefathers appeared and entreated forbearance, and at length he cast the fire of his wrath into the sea, where it became a huge horse's head,<sup>3</sup> as those know who know the Veda.<sup>4</sup>

The Purana fable drops the Haihayas altogether and says Ūrva was celibate and practising austerities. The munis expostulated with him for not continuing his family; so in dudgeon he put his thigh into fire and rubbed it; and forthwith from his thigh<sup>5</sup> was born as a son a Fire. Spreading everywhere and burning all creatures this Antaka Fire grew, but Brahmā intervened and assigned it to the *vaḍabāmukha* in the ocean, declaring that it would burn up gods, demons, and all beings at the dissolution. It was a fuel-less fire, a terrible māyā, fashioned by Ūrva's son Aurva Agni. The fable adds that the demon king Hiraṇyakaśipu, seeing all that, obtained the promise of that māyā,<sup>6</sup> and

<sup>1</sup> Also Mahābhārata i, 66, 2610. Brahmāṇḍa iii, 1, 95.

<sup>2</sup> Some of the passages say it was Ūrva who was so born, but the difference is immaterial here.

<sup>3</sup> *Haya-śiras*, which = *vaḍabāmukha*.

<sup>4</sup> The reference appears to be to Rigveda viii, 102, 4.

<sup>5</sup> From the father's thigh, also Vāyu 65, 92 (where for *tūrva* read *tŪrva*).

<sup>6</sup> Matsya 175, 63-75: Padma v, 38, 113-24: Hariv. 46, 2570-82.

consequently in a great battle with the gods the demons made use of it with disastrous effect on the gods.<sup>1</sup>

These fables are an excellent instance of the way in which the brahmans confused and mythologized traditional history. Aurva, son of Ūrva, became a son born from the thigh (*ūru*). Then, because of the fierce anger felt by the Bhārgavas against their persecutors coupled with the names Jamadagni and Agni, the idea of fire became blended with that explanation, so that Aurva was dazzling like the noonday sun and nourished against those enemies a wrath compared to fire; and this notion developed into the statement that he was Aurva Agni, an embodied Fire raging for general destruction. Next Aurva was apparently connected with the earth (*urvī*), and so the fire of Aurva's wrath was capable of destroying the whole earth; and thus it and Aurva Agni became a world-devastating fire.<sup>2</sup> This led on to its connexion with fire inside the earth, and it became the fire existing as the *vaḍabāmukha* beneath the ocean.<sup>3</sup> Finally its latency and destructive power suggested that it was the *antaka* or *saṁvartaka* fire, which will consume the world at the dissolution.<sup>4</sup> It is etherealized as a fire persisting without fuel, an *aurvī māyā*, and is at length identified with Viṣṇu.<sup>5</sup> The derivation of Aurva from *ūru* may be popular fancy, but all the rest of this mythologizing is brahmanical, one of the best instances of the confusion produced by the lack of the historical sense.

<sup>1</sup> Matsya 175, 18-22: Padma v, 38, 69-73: Hariv. 46, 2522-6.

<sup>2</sup> See also Vāyu 97, 18.

<sup>3</sup> Also Raghuvamśa ix, 82. See Matsya 51, 29-30.

<sup>4</sup> Also Matsya 2, 5.

<sup>5</sup> Hariv. 47, 2149. Cf. Mahābhārata iii, 189, 12961, 12966-7.



### XIII

## PICTOGRAPHIC RECONNAISSANCES

### PART III

By L. C. HOPKINS

*(Continued from Parts III and IV of the Journal, 1918.)*

A BAD plan, they say, is better than no plan at all, and I think it must be so. Perhaps, too, a less morbid attraction to perplexing problems might have avoided, or more Pelmanistic concentration reduced, the unanticipated disproportion of treatment in the present instalment of these Papers.

To tell the truth, I did begin on a plan, but on reaching the character 𐄂 ssũ it was lost in the arid deserts of phonetic arguments. And with it went my Dream. A Dream in which I saw a brilliant succession of entries where, set forth in brief but lucid English, convincing and logical reasoning flowed limpidly onwards to discoveries not less surprising by their character than stimulating in their consequences. It was a fair vision indeed, pity that it did not last long.

But why deride the iridescent cloud-scapes of Dreams, glowing in a light that never was on land or sea, when we awake to the drab disillusion of what we call realities? And to come to the matter in hand, one most pleasant feature in the Dream prospect was that these studies were pursued with entire freedom from the incubus of phonetic arguments, which are, I am afraid, very distasteful to most readers. Moreover, they of themselves destroy the chances of brief treatment. But circumstance is stronger than human will, and in the hope of carrying more conviction of the truth of the results, I have been constrained to appeal oftener than

I wished to corroborative or supplementary evidence from the phonetic side.

*Sui* 歲 harvest, year, also the planet Jupiter. *Significance of the archaic forms* (Figs. 277-82). Not clear. According to the *Shuo Wen*, composed of 步 *pu*, pace, progress, and 戌 *hsü*, as the phonetic. And Hsü Shên explains the relevance of the ideographic element by adducing from the Astronomical Section of the *Hun Shu* a passage which speaks of the Five Planets as the 五步 *wu pu*, Five Paces or Pacers. Some symbol of motion is, in fact, not unsuited to words implying succession or periodicity. *Hsü* (*süt* in Cantonese) 戌 seems but a poor phonetic key to a word pronounced *sui*, though *Kanghsi* also gives *süt* as an occasional sound for this character. Lo Chên-yü indeed denies that 戌 *hsü* is involved, and claims 戌 *yüeh* (*yüt* in Cantonese) battle-ax, which as a phonetic is hardly better, though in point of form rather preferable. These uncertainties of construction prevent us from determining whether the character for *sui* is a Phonetic, or a Suggestive, Compound, whether, that is, either part of the character was added for reasons of sound only.

*Pi* 鄙 rustic; originally, a frontier or provincial town, distinct from 都 *tu*, a capital city. *Significance of the archaic forms* (Figs. 283-7). Not altogether clear in detail, but the character is a compound of two elements, neither being here phonetic. The upper rectangular or oval outline which, as an independent sign stands for *wai*, to surround, now written 囿, has a merely categorical or determinative value, that is, it is an ancient mode of what is now termed a Radical or Classifier, and conveys ideographically the order of ideas under which the word signified falls. It is consequently generic, while the remainder of the compound has a specific value. This remainder is the ancient script of the character 囿, now written in the augmented form 廩 *lin*, a granary:

This word is described as connoting a granary open to the air, or sometimes, as having a skylight, 天窗 *t'ien ch'uang*. And we have little room for doubt that the lower part of the archaic symbol is an outline of such a building, somewhat disguised by schematic simplification. I should suggest a restoration of the ideal type in some such shape as is shown hypothetically in Fig. 288, where the ventilated opensided louvre is indicated above the main roofing. The drawing of a granary for a word meaning "town" is, as Lo Chên-yü thinks, explained by the fact that "where a public granary is to be seen, there also we know must be a town", 觀倉廩所在亦可知爲邑矣. The full significance is therefore a town having a public granary. I am, of course, speaking of the significance of the character *qua* character or graphic design intended to illustrate and suggest the corresponding word, whose etymological sense may be entirely disparate.

Lo further comments as follows on the character: "This is the original character of the word *pi* in the expression 都鄙 *tu pi*, capital and provincial cities. The *Shuo Wen* considers it as the syllable *pi* in 𡵓 𡵓 *pi sé*, niggardly, and treats 鄙 *pi* as the character for the *pi* of *tu pi*. The latter word when it occurs on ancient Bronzes is equally written without the determinative 邑 *i* [of which 阝 is the combining form], which is an addition of later times." He points out also that occasionally, as in Fig. 285, the uppermost element is omitted.

*Hsing* 行, also in certain senses pronounced *hang* and *héng*, to go, pass, a passage, a row, a range. *Significance of the archaic forms* (Figs. 289-91). Lo Chên-yü's explanation is so plausible and attractive that though personally I feel obliged to reserve complete assent, I do not wish to argue against it. He considers the original design shown in Fig. 289 to be a diagram of four cross-roads, or as he words it, "thoroughfares in four directions,



along which people pass," 四達之衢人所行也. And indeed, as I shall show below, the argument in favour of this view is even stronger than he states it.

Lo continues: "One form of the character on the Stone Drums contains in addition the figure of a man, and is written as Fig. 292, the significance of this being obvious. When from 𠂔 the character was modified to 𠂔, the outline had already partly lost its primitive shape, and in 𠂔, the [Lesser Seal] script of Hsü's work, the significance of the form is entirely obscured. In consequence Hsü's explanation of 行 *hsing* as 'a man speeding onwards on foot', 人之步趨 *jén chih pu ch'ü*, which implies that the character is composed of 𠂔 *ch'ih*, 'a short pace,' and 𠂔 *ch'u*, 'to finish a pace,' goes very widely astray. In ancient times, characters composed with 行 *hsing* sometimes omitted the right-hand half, and were then written with 𠂔, sometimes the left-hand half, and were then written with 𠂔. Hsü's error in supposing these two halves of 行 were two separate characters, was due to the primitive outline having been lost in the course of repeated copyings. The form 𠂔, found on the Bronze known as the 父辛觶 *Fu Hsing Chih*, also agrees with that [sometimes] occurring in the oracular sentences [of the Honan Bones]. The explanation 'passages in a Palace', 宮中道 *kung chung tao*, given in the *Shuo Wen* under the character 𠂔 *k'un*, implies precisely this figure 𠂔. When Hsü analyses this character *k'un* as 'composed with 口 *wei*, to surround, depicting Palace walls over a road', 象宮垣道上之形, he was unaware that 口 only depicts the Palace walls, but that what depicts the passage-ways 道路 is the symbol 𠂔 within the 口."

So far Lo Chên-yü. It should perhaps be noted that while the figure with the four right angles is a rare one

either on the Bones or the Bronzes, such examples as Figs. 290 and 291 are extremely common, but these of course would soon have resulted from their easier and more rapid formation in practice.

A character whose modern equivalent is as yet undetermined might have been, but is not, adduced by Lo in support of his view of the origin of 行 *hsing*. At any rate it appears to weigh heavily on his side. Two examples are given in Figs. 293 and 294. They consist, it will be seen, of the figure under review and four feet or footprints (止 *chih*), each represented as starting outwards along the four cross-roads of Lo's hypothesis. It would be easy to suggest but premature to determine the modern character, and with it the word, corresponding to this ancient graphic complex, though I should add that Lo includes the form on his p. 58 as one of the variants of 衛 *wei*, to guard or surround.

A further fact in favour of Lo's argument may be adduced in conclusion.

In several issues of the Chinese Archæological Review, *I Shu Ts'ung Pien*, 藝術叢編, Lo Chên-yü has reproduced a number of *Relics of Yin Dynasty Writing* 殷文存, divided into two parts, 上 *Shang* and 下 *Hsia*. On p. 20 of Part I we come upon Fig. 295, and on p. 24 of Part II a reversed form, Fig. 296, both alike being archaic versions of 陟, a character stated by *Kanghsi* to be a variant of 陟 *chih*, to mount. In these two figures we have the four cross-roads solution strongly confirmed, the footsteps going, as Chinese would consider, north, passing in one case the road running east, and west in the other. It is a neat and unexpected piece of evidence in Lo's support.

Yu 囿, an enclosed park. *Significance of the archaic forms* (Figs. 297-8). A space enclosed and subdivided, containing woods. According to "another explanation" quoted by the *Shuo Wen*, *yu* is the term applied to

a place for rearing birds and beasts, a Zoological Garden in fact. Note the variant in Fig. 299 in the latter work, which is there called the *chou wén* or Greater Seal form. We should notice in passing that whereas the archaic and the *chou wén* forms are a complex of ideograms (that is, in my usage of this term, characters requisitioned for their sense only, without regard to their sounds, and therefore as it were devitalized characters), the Lesser Seal and modern forms fall under the Phonetic Compound class, with 有 *yu* as the phonetic.

Notice also the optional use of four 𣎵 or symbols of herbage, in place of the same number of 木, figures of trees, a variation already remarked under 莫 *mu*, evening.

Ssǎ 汜. The name of a river in Honan. *Significance of the archaic form* (Fig. 300). None; this being an early example of a Phonetic Compound, in which 汜 *ssǎ* is phonetic, *q.d.* "the water or river called *ssǎ*". But this otherwise uninteresting character provides an occasion for examining the origin of the phonetic element 𣎵, which is far from lacking interest, and requires an entry to itself.

Ssǎ 𣎵. Original or etymological sense uncertain, but its functional meaning is as the name of the sixth of the Twelve Branches, or Duodenary Cycle. *Significance of the archaic forms* (Figs. 301-5). The human foetus. There is general agreement as to this, and the old forms of 𣎵 *pao*, to wrap, enfold (see Fig. 306), illustrating as they do the particular instance of wrapping or enfolding exhibited by the foetus 𣎵 held in the womb 𠂇 (probably representing an ideal type 𠂇), would alone suffice to prove this. The odd fact is that Hsü Shên, the author of the *Shuo Wen*, though he explicitly analyses 𣎵 *pao* as above described, also and inconsistently affirms under the character 𣎵 *ssǎ* itself—if indeed the passage is really

his—that *ssũ* depicts a snake. If we had not the other and better explanation of 巳 *ssũ*, this would no doubt have been at least plausible, especially in view of 乙 the Lesser Seal version, which has a sinuous and snake-like contour. But of two things one; the character cannot have been a picture both of a snake and of a foetus.

From the pictogram we might logically infer that the etymological sense of the word *ssũ* must have included the idea of embryonic or uncompleted growth, and Chalmers has in fact suggested (*Structure of Chinese Characters*, p. 24) that “ 巳 *tsze, sze*, may be from the same root as 子 *tsze*”, the latter word meaning “child”. However this may be, no such sense any longer attaches to 巳 *ssũ* in the spoken or written language. But this ancient homophony of 巳 and 子, paralleled in modern Cantonese, provides the only explanation of a fact that has troubled and baffled Lo Chên-yü, I mean the constant occurrence on the Honan relics, and less often on early Bronzes, of the character 子 *tsũ* in Cycle couplets where 巳 *ssũ* and not 子 *tsũ* should appear. In fact, Lo goes so far as to say that though 巳 *ssũ* does occur on the Bones, it is never found thus written in the Cycle couplets, neither for itself, nor as we might consequently have expected, for 子 *tsũ*.

And here, if Prudence were always the guiding star of a Pioneer, it would perhaps be well to stop. But ever and anon there beckon to him the scintillations of a more alluring ray, and in a kind of timorous temerity he needs must follow where that bright enigma leads, knowing that to flinch or turn aside his gaze would prove him recreant to the explorer's spirit.

I 巳, to finish, past, already. A student anxious to find in the *Shuo Wen* the Lesser Seal shape of this common character, after spending a few hours on the search, might easily conclude it was not there. And, indeed, if it is not one of the two entries under Hsi's 533rd Radical, it is

not there. But the first of the two entries is, he knows, 巳 *ssũ*, the Cycle character just discussed, which has not the right sound, and the second, though, as he discovers, it has the right sound, is, he learns, an older form of 以 *i*, to use, which surely cannot be his word, for its meaning is quite different and unrelated. And yet under that Radical, 巳 *i* lurks darkly!

Let us, after a preliminary invocation to the spirit of Sherlock Holmes, attempt to penetrate the disguise.

In the first place, we observe that Hsü Shên, immediately after the Lesser Seal form of 巳 *ssũ*, adds by way of explanation the two characters “巳 也” *ssũ yeh*. These at least are those printed (correctly as I hope to show) by Tuan Yü-ts'ai in his edition. But other editors print 巳 也 *i yeh*. According as we follow Tuan or the others, the rendering would be literally, “巳 *ssũ* is 巳 *ssũ*,” or, “巳 *ssũ* is 巳 *i*.” So far, brief and oracular. But the text continues, in the modern script employed by the author for everything but the Entry characters, 四月陽氣巳出陰氣巳藏 *ssũ yuch yang ch'i ssũ ch'u yin ch'i ssũ tsang*, “in the fourth month the Positive power has finally issued, and the Negative power finally withdrawn.” By this evidently allusive passage, Hsü must mean to associate the sense of the syllable in 巳 出 and 巳 藏 (*ssũ ch'u* and *ssũ tsang*) with the first of his two explanatory words, otherwise the passage is irrelevant. Accordingly, giving an expanded paraphrase of his three words, we should understand, “The Lesser Seal form 𠄎 is the same character as that which has the meaning of *finished*.” Otherwise put, the Seal character for 巳 *i* is the same as that for 巳 *ssũ*, the sixth of the Twelve Branches.

If I am right in thus reasoning, Hsü Shên wished in this oblique way to include in his collection of Lesser Seal forms a character which was distinct in its functional

meaning from the Cycle-sign, but not in its older form, nor, as we shall see below, in its sound.

That in *form* the two characters were often identical in the early part of the Han Dynasty, I am most fortunately able to demonstrate from the published records of Sir A. Stein's great finds, illustrated and translated by the late Édouard Chavannes.<sup>1</sup> Thus in the wooden slip numbered 182 the character 卩 *ssũ* is written 卩. On No. 271, which twice contains the date T'ien Han 天漢 3rd year = B.C. 98, and thus appears to be the oldest dated document in the collection, we have 卩 *i* written 卩; so again on No. 175. On the other hand, one instance, No. 425, can be found in these Han Dynasty wooden slips where 卩 *i* is written with the head open 卩, a form not distinguishable from 卩 *chi*, self.

On the whole, the evidence justifies us in concluding that in the first part of the Han era, when Hsü Shên was compiling the *Shuo Wen*, *ssũ* and *i* were usually written with the same character 卩, but that the slight modern distinction of form between them was not even then unknown.

But to all this argument based upon graphic considerations, an opponent might plead the following phonetic demurrer. He might say, "Of what use is it to show that the same graphic sign was common to 卩 *ssũ* and 卩 *i* in Han times, when the *words* behind the two characters are totally unlike, both in sense as far as we know, and in sound as our ears tell us at once?" This demurrer cannot be ignored, and I shall not attempt to do so.

In the first place, as to the sense of the two syllables now pronounced *ssũ* and *i*, I know of no evidence enabling us either to affirm or disprove an original identity.

<sup>1</sup> *Documents Chinois découverts par Aurel Stein.*

I must therefore leave this point alone. Nor, in fact, does it much concern us.

But as regards the sounds it is otherwise, and I shall give reasons for the conclusions (1) that these two characters now pronounced *ssŭ* and *i* respectively, were as late as the Han era, say up to the third century A.D., pronounced alike; (2) that this identical sound was *ssŭ* or *shih*; and (3) that in this case (and *obiter dictum* in many others) the present sound *i* or *yi* is the worn-down remnant of an ancient syllable with a sibilant initial (and in other cases, of syllables with various other consonantal initials). To take these points in order:—

1. Tuan Yü-ts'ai in his edition of the *Shuo Wen*, commenting on the character 巳 *ssŭ*, cites a passage from a comment on the *Ssu Kan* 斯干 *Ode*, which declares that the character 似 *ssŭ* used therein is read as though it stood for the 巳 *ssŭ* of the Twelve Branches, and that thus reading 巳 續, the meaning, as paraphrased, is 巳 成,<sup>1</sup> "finally completed." On this, Tuan remarks, "This shows that in the mouths of the men of Han times the word *ssŭ* of the Cycle series, and the word [now pronounced] *i* in the phrase 已然 *i jan*, past, already, had not two sounds. Their senses differed indeed, but were similar," 此可見漢人巳午與已然無二音其義則異而同也.

But here Tuan Yü-ts'ai, having brought us thus far on our phonetic road, falls into sudden and tantalizing silence, and leaves us to draw our own conclusions as to what that single sound was. Another authority, the *Yün Pu* 韻補 *Dictionary*, cited in *Kanghsi*, also says, "The ancient word 巳 in the Cycle couplet 巳 午 was also read like the word 巳 of the phrase 巳 矣 *i i*, "and that's all," as

<sup>1</sup> By which must be meant 巳 成 *i ch'êng*, as we should write, and possibly as the earlier commentator *did* write. But Tuan was not the sort of purist that would give way to such a vulgarism as 巳, as we see below.

now pronounced, 古已午之已亦讀如已矣之已. Here I think it is clear that the *Yün Pu* believed the single sound to be *i* and not *ssü*. That there was in ancient times only one sound for these two syllables, now separated into *ssü* and *i*, is also the conclusion to which the accessible evidence has gradually led me. But the same evidence has also led me to the conclusion that this ancient sound could not have been *i*, as Chinese scholars seem to infer, but was on the contrary *ssü*, or at least a syllable having a sibilant initial.

2. For it appears impossible to believe that an original vowel or semi-vowel such as *i* or *yi* could by mere efflux of time have generated a strong hissing sibilant such as *ssü* or *shih*.

3. But it is much easier and quite reasonable to accept *i* as the final result of a process of phonetic wear and tear prolonged through many hundreds of years among unnumbered millions of speakers, along the successive stages of perhaps *ssü*, *shih*, *jih*, and *i*.

Such a process of syllabic decay due to colloquial detrition as is here postulated would explain the following otherwise anomalous facts. While 以 is pronounced *i*, 似 and 妣, in which 以 is phonetic, are both *ssü*. Again, the two forms 厶 and 呂 are admittedly variants from the same original character, but the first has the sound *ssü*, the second *i*. While 呂 standing alone is equivalent to 以 *i*, and is so pronounced, the character 耜, a plough-share, in which it enters as phonetic, has the sound *ssü*. So, again, 台 alone is correctly read *i*, but 耜, a plough-handle, composed of 木 *mu*, wood, and 台 as phonetic, is *ssü*. Numerous other such cases can be found, but I need not elaborate the point further.

Hence the outcome of all this is that the original script and sounds of *ssü* 巳 and *i* 己 were the same, and unless they are ultimately the same word, with senses gradually differentiated, then the syllable now pronounced



*i* must have borrowed the character of the other, as a homophone, as was the common practice in ancient times.

I 以, sometimes and puristically written 𠄎, to use, to cause, to make act.

2. *Ssŭ* 厶, not now used alone (except by a modern convention as a symbol for "so-and-so", and then read *mou*), but according to the Dictionaries having the same sense as 私 *ssŭ*, private.

3. I 台, a character found with several unrelated meanings, besides acting for another word and character *t'ai* 臺, with further distinct meanings. Pronounced *i*, it is often found on ancient Bronzes used where 以 would now be written. I need not repeat what I have just shown reasons for believing, namely, that all these forms represent a single word which was anciently pronounced *ssŭ*.

These four characters 𠄎 以 厶 台 then, so unlike in their present shapes, are, notwithstanding, but variant developments, or, in the case of two of them, contain such developments, of a simple primitive pictogram. And we can explain the *Significance of the archaic forms* (Figs. 307-9) as the figure of a bent-handled spoon or ladle. The word which I suggest is behind the character is *ssŭ*, now written in an entirely different manner as 杓, with 木 wood as a Determinative and 四 *ssŭ*, four, as the Phonetic. This is a rare word, but occurs once in the *Li Chi*, in the term 角杓 *chio ssŭ*, rendered by Couvreur "un cuiller de corne". I suppose that the word *ssŭ*, spoon, being then a homophone of *ssŭ*, to use (now pronounced *i*), the character for "spoon" was borrowed for the word "use", a much oftener needed term, but also much more perplexing to write, unless by this method of loan. And finally, when the cuckoo syllable "use" had ousted the foster word "spoon" from its own pictographic nest, the homeless victim had to be provided with a new

scription in the shape of 𠂔 *ssũ*, to serve for the rare needs of its original sense.

It is not difficult to show the filiation of the four variations exhibited above at the beginning of this entry, from the archaic type represented in Fig. 307. The simplest perhaps is 𠂔 *ssũ*, the Lesser Seal of which is seen in Fig. 310, where the handle has been simplified by straightening, and the bowl from an oval has become round. The modern 𠂔, of which the left-hand side of 𠂔 is a combining form, is mainly due to the action of the Chinese writing-brush. To this character was added 人 *jén*, man, as a Determinative, thus making 𠂔 *i*, to indicate vaguely the verbal quality of the word *i*, to use. I do not think an example of the compound can be found prior to Han times. Figs. 311-14 are from specimens in the Stein collection of wooden slips published in *Documents Chinois découverts par Aurel Stein*, Nos. 158, 273, 311, and 313, and show simple triangles in three instances. The 人 *jén* is much elongated.

Finally, we have another compound figure in 𠂔 *i*, of which numerous well-established archaic examples attest the type (Fig. 315), frequently found on ancient Bronzes, written where we should write 𠂔 *i*. This type, however, consists not of 𠂔 *ssũ* and 人 *jén*, man, but of 𠂔 plus 𠂔, which on the face of it is *k'ou*, mouth. But in this combination, as in some others, there is much reason to believe the original pictogram was not that of a mouth, but of a quite different object. I call attention to a short but valuable note of Lo Chên-yü, on p. 25 of his small volume 殷虛書契待問編 or *Chapter of Unsolved Problems of the Records of the Tumulus of Yin*. He remarks, "In all, there are here twenty-two characters written with 𠂔," and adds, 𠂔 所以薦物之器與口舌之口不同, "The 𠂔 is a vessel for offering objects in worship, and is not the same as the 𠂔 *k'ou*, in the expression *k'ou shé*, mouth and tongue." Lo is, I am

confident, well-advised in pointing out the double origin of this symbol in Chinese writing, and in 台 *i* I believe we have another instance to add to the list. I conjecture that this combination represents a spoon over a bowl or basin, and is nothing but an augmented variant of 凵 *ssũ*, and that like the simpler figure, it was borrowed to write the homophonous word *ssũ*, now *i*, to use.

I ought to mention that the three forms (Figs. 316-18), cited by Lo from the Honan Bones are equated by him with 𠂔 *i*, and they may well be what he believes, but the contexts do not make this clear, and I regard the identification as doubtful.

In conclusion, I should like to draw attention to Figs. 319-22, which exhibit remarkable variants in the second member of the Cycle couplets concerned. In each of these examples we have the archaic form common to 凵 *ssũ* and 以 *i*, standing where 巳 *ssũ* was to be expected, with which as a homophone it was evidently sometimes interchanged. Lo has no knowledge of this substitution, for he nowhere gives any example, and these are all from collections to which he has had no access. It is as though 癸 凵, 己 凵, and 辛 凵 were written in modern style.

Chou 州. At present only in use as an administrative district, but originally an eyot or flat island in a river, now written 洲 *chou*, though very early applied to much larger tracts. *Significance of the archaic forms* (Figs. 323-5). Apparently a bird's-eye view of an island in midstream (the design in the Lesser Seal variant, Fig. 326, being triplicated). The third and angulated form is a crude variation from an ancient Spade-coin.

Chalfant, *Early Chinese Writing*, plate xix, No. 256, had conjectured as the "probable original" a form (𠂔), and had he known of it at the time of writing could hardly have failed to support his conjecture by adducing

a character shown in Fig. 327, published by Lo Chên-yü<sup>1</sup> from the Honan Bones, for the latter heretofore unknown sign contains the same elements, being made up of 水 *shui*, water, and 中 *chung*, middle. Nevertheless, I do not believe that we have here the origin of the character 州 *chow*. The unknown might plausibly claim to be 沖 *ch'ung*, to collide with. But the archaic shapes of *chow*, shown in the Figures, present an independent contour for the island, not derived from *chung*, middle, at all.

Lo Chên-yü points out the identity of the *Shuo Wen*'s "ancient form" (Fig. 328) with our archaic type (one of the not too numerous cases where Hsü's *Ku wen* examples are confirmed), except that the curvatures of the lateral strokes have been distorted in the course of numerous copyings. He cites also the *Shuo Wen*'s explanation that *chow* is "habitable land amid the waters", and regards the two sides of the archaic sign as the flowing current, and the central part as depicting land.

*Chiao* 交, to join, blend, unite (Figs. 329-32).

Before stating my conjectural solution of the significance of this puzzling character, it will be advisable to see what the *Shuo Wen* has to say about it, for it is in its pages and in those of the *Liu Shu Lio* Section of the *T'ung Chih* of Chêng Ch'iao that, as I believe, the true clue will be found.

*Chiao* 交 is the 393rd Radical or Entry-character in the former work. The Seal Character form, Fig. 333, is immediately followed by the three words of explanation, 交脛也 *chiao ching yeh*. On the face of it this passage means, "交 *chiao* is *chiao-ching*." What, then, is 交脛 *chiao ching*?

The more recent editors of the *Shuo Wen* appear, undoubtedly, to take the phrase as meaning "cross-shanked", and presumably to regard the character 交 as

<sup>1</sup> Yin Hsü Shu Ch'i, 後編, p. 36.

representing a man with some malformation of the lower limbs expressed by the alteration from the normal form in 大 to the deformity in 𡗗. Thus Tuan Yü-ts'ai begins his notes on the character by saying 交脛謂之交, meaning "Cross-legged is termed *chiao*", and goes on to add that "by extension" *chiao* is the general term for all things that cross or blend, 引申之爲凡交之偶.

Wang Yün in his edition quotes a passage from the *Shan Hai Ching* 山海經, where *chiao-ching* is used as the name of a country, thus, 交脛人國腳脛曲戾相交所以謂之交趾, "The country of cross-shanked men, whose legs are twisted across each other, whence the name cross-feet." In passing we may note that the last two characters are not, as we might have expected they would be, a repetition of the first two. In any case, the first two, pronounced in Cantonese *Kao hing*, account, as the Rev. A. C. Moule suggests, for the European name Cochin, better than the last two which omit the final *n*. Leaving this minor point, it seems clear that recent editors of the *Shuo Wen* suppose Hsü's term 交脛 *chiao ching* to mean cross-shanked or cross-legged.

But was that in fact the sense which Hsü himself intended?


Let us examine the point from another side. Chêng Ch'iao, 鄭樵 (A.D. 1108-62), whom Mayers ranks as "one of the most erudite and renowned men of letters of the Sung dynasty; distinguished by almost universal knowledge", devotes part of his great work the *T'ung Chih* to a *Summary Account of the Six Scripts*, 六書略, *Liu Shu Lio*. This compendium is full of interest. It is, however, a treatise equally inadvisable to follow in faith or to neglect in contempt, and is most profitable when read with discriminating scepticism. Now, in one place Chêng discusses the significance of the character 了 *liao*, to finish, which he asserts to be, under its older


form, the figure of a phallus, and, I may add, consequently the true way of writing 屢 *liao*, a modern character with the same sense. For the moment I am not concerned to argue for or against this view. But we should note that the author in a passage to the above effect, on p. 9, pt. i, of the *Liu Shu Liao*, defines 了 *liao* as 脛之推骨, "the pushing-bone of the legs." And in a later passage, p. 8, pt. v, he writes, 了者交脛之端也, "*Liao* is the extremity of the *chiao ching*." This passage is crucial for the sense of 交脛 *chiao ching* as used by Chêng Ch'iao. We know already what he considered 了 *liao*, to represent. It is obvious that it is incompatible with the sense of "cross-shanked" for *chiao ching*. I see no way of escaping the conclusion, remembering his previous definition of *liao* as "the pushing-bone of the legs", that Chêng used *chiao ching* as meaning literally "the junction of the legs or shanks", that is, the pelvis, to which the legs are attached at the hips. I presume further that the "pushing-bone" must be the *os pubis*, which does, in fact, project from the pelvic arch, and perhaps was considered by Chinese physiologists to support the phallus in its more phallic moments.

At any rate I am now ready to propound, as the *Significance of the archaic forms* of 交, a skeletal and schematic human figure emphasizing, by exaggeration, the pelvic arch.

And I conclude that Hsü Shên used the term 交脛 *chiao-ching*, just as Chêng Ch'iao used it a thousand years later, to mean the *pelvis* or bones with which the legs unite, and that this meaning having since become obsolete, the baneful influence of democratic etymology has stepped in and supplied a spurious predication.

Tsai 𠂔 and 𠂔, calamity. *Significance of the archaic forms* (Figs. 337-45). Not fully ascertained, but involving water in motion. In view of the aspect of some of the above archaic variants, it seems difficult to accept as

completely satisfactory the usual Chinese opinion based on the figure , that the design is of a stream *Ji ch'uan*, blocked by some barrier causing it to overflow in devastating floods. Such an account would be adequate if this figure stood alone, but it does not explain the fuller and differing conformation of Figs. 334-6 and 338, still less those of the type shown in the last part of this series. These last, however, Lo Chên-yü considers to represent (or to symbolize) waters flowing laterally in inundations. All that seems safe to predicate of these forms is that they represent water in some unfavourable circumstances, and this method of transforming lines normally vertical to a direction horizontal and consequently abnormal, may well be a symbolic indication of the disastrous lateral overflows caused by sudden obstructions to the current of a river.

We should notice the three curving lines without any addition, which would justify our supposing that we had to do with the old form of *Ji ch'uan*, stream, were not the contexts decisive against this. Possibly this simplest version of  may be due to mere contraction by the withdrawal of the horizontal bar.

*I 益*, to overflow, abound. *Significance of the archaic forms* (Figs. 346-50).

Water filling and rising above the brim of a vessel. These old forms differ from the Lesser Seal, Fig. 351, and modern character, in which *all* the water is represented above the brim. Notice the alternative combining-form of water, consisting only of drops without a central line.

The last two examples are from two Bronze vessels cited by Wu Ta-ch'êng in the 2nd edition of his *Shuo Wen Ku Chou Pu*, but in type they are more aberrant in their treatment of the water element which has been contracted out of recognition.





277	𠂇	278	𠂇	279	𠂇	280	𠂇	281	𠂇	282	𠂇	283	𠂇	284	𠂇	285	𠂇	286	𠂇	287	𠂇	288	𠂇	289	𠂇	290	𠂇	291	𠂇
292	𠂇	292A	𠂇	293	𠂇	294	𠂇	295	𠂇	296	𠂇	297	𠂇	298	𠂇	299	𠂇	300	𠂇	301	𠂇	302	𠂇	303	𠂇	304	𠂇	305	𠂇
307	𠂇	308	𠂇	309	𠂇	310	𠂇	311	𠂇	312	𠂇	313	𠂇	314	𠂇	315	𠂇	316	𠂇	317	𠂇	318	𠂇	319	𠂇	320	𠂇	321	𠂇
323	𠂇	324	𠂇	325	𠂇	326	𠂇	327	𠂇	328	𠂇	329	𠂇	330	𠂇	331	𠂇	332	𠂇	333	𠂇	334	𠂇	335	𠂇	337	𠂇	338	𠂇
340	𠂇	341	𠂇	342	𠂇	343	𠂇	344	𠂇	345	𠂇	346	𠂇	347	𠂇	348	𠂇	349	𠂇	350	𠂇	351	𠂇						

LIST OF REFERENCES FOR FIGURES IN PLATE III

Abbreviations

C.K.L.C.W. = *Chün Ku Lu Chin Wen* 據古錄金文.

H. = Hopkins Collection.

S.W. = *Shuo Wen* 說文.

S.W.K.C.P. = *Shuo Wen Ku Chou Pu* 說文古籍補.

Y.H.S.K. = *Yin Hsü Shu Ch'i* 殷虛書契.


Y.H.S.K.T.H. = *Yin Hsü Shu Ch'i Tsing Hua* 殷虛書契菁華.

*Yin Wen Tsun*, 殷文存.

- |  |  |
|--|--|
| 277. T.Y.T.K.C.Y., p. 1.                   | 305. H., 88 (in comp.).                |
| 278. Y.H.S.K., viii, 3.                    | 306. Lesser Seal.                      |
| 279. H., 377.                              | 307. S.W.K.C.P., ii, 91.               |
| 280. S.W.K.C.P., i, 7.                     | 308. „ ii, 91.                         |
| 281. „ i, 7.                               | 309. „ ii, 91.                         |
| 282. C.K.L.C.W., vii, 44.                  | 310. Lesser Seal.                      |
| 283. H., 728.                              | 311. }                                 |
| 284. Y.H.S.K., iv, 11.                     | 312. } <i>Documents Chinois, etc.,</i> |
| 285. „ iv, 11.                             | 313. } Nos. 158, 273, 311, 313.        |
| 286. Y.H.S.K.T.H., p. 2.                   | 314. }                                 |
| 287. Y.H.S.K., vii, 21.                    | 315. S.W.K.C.P., i, 5.                 |
| 288. Hypothetical ideal form.              | 316. Y.H.S.K., i, 26.                  |
| 289. Y.H.S.K., 2nd part, 下, p. 2.          | 317. „ i, 24.                          |
| 290. S.W.K.C.P., i, 9, and H., 569.        | 318. „ v, 32.                          |
| 291. H., 696.                              | 319. } British Museum (Couling-        |
| 292. Stone Drums.                          | 320. } Chalfant Collection),           |
| 292A. Lesser Seal.                         | 321. } C. 2000.                        |
| 293. Y.H.S.K., 2nd part, 下, p. 11.         | 322. H., 252.                          |
| 294. „ viii, 4.                            | 323. Y.H.S.K., iv, 13.                 |
| 295. <i>Yin Wen Ts'un</i> , Part I, p. 20. | 324. S.W.K.C.P., ii, 64.               |
| 296. „ „ II, p. 24.                        | 325. „ ii, 64.                         |
| 297. Y.H.S.K., iv, 12.                     | 326. Lesser Seal.                      |
| 298. „ iv, 53.                             | 327. Y.H.S.K., 2nd part, 下, p. 36.     |
| 299. S.W., <i>Chou wen</i> form.           | 328. S.W., <i>Ku wen</i> form.         |
| 300. Y.H.S.K., iv, 13.                     | 329. S.W.K.C.P., i, 16 (in comp.).     |
| 301. S.W.K.C.P., ii, 91.                   | 330. Y.H.S.K., v, 33 „                 |
| 302. „ ii, 91.                             | 331. „ v, 33 „                         |
| 303. C.K.L.C.W., vii, 7 (in comp.).        | 332. H., 341 (in comp.).               |
| 304. Y.H.S.K., iv, 19 „                    | 333. Lesser Seal.                      |

- |      |                   |      |                            |
|------|-------------------|------|----------------------------|
| 334. | Y.H.S.K., ii, 23. | 343. | Y.H.S.K., iv, 14.          |
| 335. | „ ii, 27.         | 344. | „ iv, 14.                  |
| 336. | „ ii, 8.          | 345. | „ vi, 45.                  |
| 337. | „ ii, 22.         | 346. | „ iv, 5.                   |
| 338. | „ ii, 21.         | 347. | „ v, 37.                   |
| 339. | „ ii, 26.         | 348. | „ v, 38.                   |
| 340. | „ ii, 29.         | 349. | S.W.K.C.P., 2nd ed., v, 5. |
| 341. | „ i, 51.          | 350. | „ „ v, 5.                  |
| 342. | „ iii, 26.        | 351. | Lesser Seal.               |
-





*To face page 389.]*

PORTRAIT OF GOSAIN JADRUP

#### XIV

### PORTRAIT OF GOSAIN JADRUP

By ANANDA K. COOMARASWAMY

THE accompanying reproduction of a picture of a seated Yogī was shown to me by the owner, a resident of Ajmere, but of whose name, unfortunately, I made no note, at Allahabad in 1911. It is of considerable interest, not only as a Mughal portrait of the very finest quality, but as an evidently authentic likeness of a famous Sādhu—the Gosāin Jadrūp—referred to at some length in the *Memoirs of Jahāngīr* and elsewhere.

The (contemporary) inscription in Persian reads:—

*1026 hijra, raqama Kanvar Dhan Sinha,  
Gosāin Jadrūp ke(?) dar Ūjāin hast*

“1026 hijra, the work of Kanvar Dhan Sinha:

Gosāin Jadrūp, who lives in Ujjayinī.”

The later inscription in corrupt Hindī, describing the saint as a friend of Dārā Shukoh (instead of Jahāngīr), reads:—

*Gosāin Chidra Rūp sanyāsī pātsyāzādāḥ Dārā Sakauha  
ke mitraḥ karāmāta bhī thī. Paṇḍita hute sakrah  
Ujen main rakhte.*

*Barē kāriḡar ke hāth kāḥ kāmāḥ ab aise citrakāra nāhīn.*

“Gosāin Chidra Rūp, friend of Prince Dārā Shukoh, he was also . . . He was learned and lived in the city of Ujjayin. This is the work of a great artist; there is no such painter nowadays.”

The last remark was doubtless already justified at the time when the Hindī inscription was added (eighteenth century?).

Jadrūp was a Hindu saint much respected by Jahāngīr, and a very full account of him is given in the *Memoirs* (Rogers & Beveridge, trans. i, pp. 355-9; ii, pp. 49, 52, 104, 105, 108). "Certainly," says Jahāngīr, "association with him was a great privilege." Also, "He has thoroughly mastered the science of the Vedānta, which is the science of Sufism." "I went on foot to see him. The place he had chosen to live in was a hole on the side of a hill which had been dug out and a door made. At the entrance there is an opening in the shape of a *mīl-rāb* . . . The hole, whence is the entrance to the abode, is in length  $5\frac{1}{2}$  knots and its breadth  $3\frac{1}{2}$  knots. A person of weak body<sup>1</sup> can only enter it with a hundred difficulties . . . It has no mat and no straw. In this narrow and dark hole he passes his time in solitude. In the cold days of winter, though he is quite naked, with the exception of a piece of rag that he has in front and behind, he never lights a fire . . . This is his method of living. He does not desire to associate with men, but, as he has obtained great notoriety, people go to see him . . . he spoke well, so much so as to make a great impression on me. My society also suited him."

The date of Jahāngīr's first visit to Jadrūp, February, 1617, corresponds with that recorded in the picture. Other accounts of Jadrūp are given in the *Ma'āsiru-l-umarā*, i, 574, and the *Iqbal-nāma*, p. 94. The name of the saint is given there as Achad or Ajhad; the first of these forms approximates to the *Chidra* of the Hindī inscription on the picture.

As regards the artist, his name does not appear to be mentioned elsewhere. He was, from his name, evidently a Hindu, and probably one of Jahāngīr's court painters.

<sup>1</sup> The emendation "thin" for "weak" has been suggested, but the picture shows that a considerable effort would be required to enter the hole, and on the other hand it is plain that no one not thin could enter it.

The picture is one of the finest of all Mughal paintings, comparable with the "Dying Man"<sup>1</sup> in importance, and illustrating the fact that the school of Jahāngīr marks the zenith of Mughal art. The delineation of character in both these works is most penetrating, and in both the figures are placed in appropriate environments which emphasize their character. The picture of Jadrūp and Jahāngīr's account of him not merely corroborate one another historically, but exhibit a characteristic aspect of Indian culture—the relation of prince to saint—in an admirable manner.

<sup>1</sup> F. R. Martin, *The Miniature Painters and Painting of India, Persia, and Turkey*; London, 1912.





## MISCELLANEOUS COMMUNICATIONS

---

### A NOTE ON THE CHINESE ATLAS IN THE MAGLIABECCHIAN LIBRARY, WITH REFERENCE TO KINSAY IN MARCO POLO

In a long note published in the Journal for January, 1917, pp. 8, 9, I quoted Yule's words: "in the Chinese Atlas, dating from 1595, which the traveller Carletti presented to the Magliabecchian Library, that city [Hang-chou] appears to be still marked with this name [Ching-shih], transcribed by Carletti as *camse*." I proceeded to say that I did not know what the Atlas in question really was.

A few weeks ago I opened by chance upon what is evidently Yule's authority, namely, the Introduction to *Il Milione di Marco Polo*, by G. B. Baldelli Boni, Florence, 1827, where a whole section is devoted to "Descrizione dell' Atlante Cinese posseduto dalla Magliabechiana", occupying pp. cix-cxxii. Baldelli's account of this Atlas in two volumes is so full (he gives a complete list of the maps, the provinces and their capitals, specimens of the population, amount of tribute, etc.) as to leave no doubt at all that the Atlas is no more nor less than the 廣興圖 *Kuang yü t'u*.

Now on p. cxii Baldelli says that Carletti wrote *Camse* for the province Kiangsi (Chiang-hsi) and *Henciu* for Hang-chou, and also, it is worth while to notice, *Ochiam* for Fukien (Fu-chien) and *Hociu* for Fu-chou. On p. cxi, Baldelli tells us that the general map of China in vol. i was missing, but that there was a map of the Empire in vol. ii, marking the two great rivers and some other details, and he adds (p. cxiii): "In quella carta alle città sono stati apposti i nomi in alfabeto Latino, e ivi si legge *Cam-se*, ove dovrebbe essere *Hang-tcheu*, che è la

Quinsai del Polo : così al suo vero luogo è *Fu-tcheu*, detto ivi *Ochiam*, capitale del *Fokien*."

The British Museum possesses a quite perfect copy of the *Kuang yü t'u*, a reprint in 1799 of an edition with Prefaces dated 1561, 1566, 1579 respectively. The map of China and the map of Chekiang in vol. i both call the place in question 杭州 Hang-chou, and the map at the beginning of vol. ii calls it 杭州總府 Hang-chou tsung fu; and Yule's idea that Hang-chou was still called Ching-shih on a native map of 1595 falls to the ground. It seems to me to be certain that the names which Carletti wrote on the map in vol. ii are the names of the *Provinces*, but Baldelli, who was able to use a Chinese dictionary, may have recognized the Chinese characters for Hang-chou and Fu-chou and assumed that *Cam-se* and *Ochiam* were intended to transcribe these, in spite of the fact that in vol. i he had seen that *Cam-se* was Kiangsi and *Ochiam* was Fukien. Thus it seems that *Camse* stands neither for Ching-shih, as Yule thought, nor for Hang-chou, as I suggested in 1917, but simply for the province of 江西 Kiangsi.

Baldelli was sorely perplexed about the date of his *Atlante Cinese*. Klaproth told him that it was of the Mongol dynasty; G. T. Staunton said it had a colophon dated 1595. Both his informants were more or less right. The original maps, or map (7 feet square) were drawn by 朱思本 Chu Ssü-pên, who is well known in connexion with the exploration of the Yellow River, as the result of ten years labour, 1311-20, and the British Museum copy has a preface dated on the summer solstice of the year 1320. But the *Kuang yü t'u* which we now possess is a revision and expansion of Chu's work made by 羅洪先 Lo Hung-hsien about the year 1540. It was printed in Chekiang and, probably, at Hang-chou by 胡松 Hu Sung apparently in 1566, although Hu's own preface is dated 1561. The prefaces in the Museum copy

are as follows: 興圖舊序 Yü t'u chiu hsi, 1320; 廣興圖序 Kuang yü t'u hsi, apparently by Lo, no date; 松嘗伏讀我 Sung ch'ang fu tu o, by Hu Sung, 1561; 廣興圖敘 Kuang yü t'u hsi, 1561; 廣興圖敘 Kuang yü t'u hsi, 1566; 刻廣興圖敘 K'ê Kuang yü t'u hsi, 1566; 重刻廣興圖敘 Ch'ung k'ê Kuang yü t'u hsi, 1579. A printed note by 章學濂 Chang Hsüeh-p'iao, dated 1799, states that this edition is a reproduction (apparently in facsimile) of one of the Ming editions. Dr. Lionel Giles kindly tells me that the colophon or postscript of the Florence copy is not found in the British Museum edition.

Baldelli corrects a slip in this edition when he says (pp. cx, cxi), that each of the squares into which the maps are divided represents a space 500 *li* square for the map of China, 100 *li* square for the maps of the Provinces, except Kuei-chou, where each is 600 *li* square. The Chinese says 每方百里 "each square 100 *li*" in every case, although the size of the squares differs greatly in the different maps.

A. C. M.

---

#### KHARAVELA

In a note entitled "New Light on Ancient India", published in the July-October (1918) issue of this Journal (pp. 543-7), Dr. V. A. Smith indicates the "significance of the main historical results clearly deducible from the new edition of Khāravēla's record", published by Messrs. Jayaswal & Banerji in the Journal of the Bihar and Orissa Research Society, vol. iii, pp. 425-507, 1917. It is fitting that the author of the *Early History of India*, at whose instance these two Indian scholars undertook the work, should do so; but it is not possible to agree with him regarding his evaluation of "the more weighty results" of their inquiries.

1. Dr. V. A. Smith writes, "The crucial question of date has been determined finally" (p. 544). In the *Memoirs of the Archaeological Survey of India*, No. 1, pp. 7-9 (?), the writer of this note has endeavoured to show that Messrs. Jayaswal & Banerji's criticism of Fleet is not convincing, and that Fleet and Lüders are right in denying the existence of any date in the Hāthigumphā inscription. If the date of the Maurya era is eliminated from the discussion of the chronological question the only resources left are palæography and the passage wherein it is said that Nāmdarāja excavated a canal in Kalinga 300 years earlier. Bühler in Table II of his *Indian Palæography* places the Hāthigumphā inscription in 150 B.C. He does so for two reasons: (1) He believed that the record was dated in the Maurya era beginning with the accession of Chandragupta. (2) When he wrote his work, no Brāhmī inscription was known that could be approximately dated either in the second or in the first century B.C. on grounds other than palæographical. But in the inscriptions on two Garuḍa pillars of Besnagar we have epigraphs that may be approximately dated within the second century B.C. with some degree of certainty. The first of these pillars is the one bearing the now famous inscription of Heliodoros, Ambassador of Antialkidas, which may be assigned to about the middle of the second century B.C. (Lüders' *List of Brāhmī Inscriptions*, No. 669). The second pillar (now in the Besnagar Museum) bears a votive inscription of the thirteenth year after the installation of Mahārāja Bhāgavata (J.B.B.R.A.S., vol. xxii, p. 144). Professor D. R. Bhandarkar rightly identifies this Mahārāja Bhāgavata with Bhāgavata, the ninth king of the Śuṅga dynasty, who is said to have reigned for thirty-two years (A.S.R., part ii, p. 190, 1913-4). So the epigraph may reasonably be assigned to the last decade of the second century B.C. The dates of the early Brāhmī inscriptions, like the Nānāghāt cave inscription

evidently belonging to the time of the third Andhra king Sātakarṇi I, and the Hāthigumphā inscription of Khāravela may now be settled, therefore, even on palæographical grounds, with a considerable degree of certainty in the light of the alphabet used in the inscriptions on the two Garuḍa pillars of Besnagar. The present writer has endeavoured to do so in the above-named memoir, and has assigned the Hāthigumphā inscription to about the middle of the first half of the first century B.C., and identified Sātakarṇi of this record with Sātakarṇi II, the sixth king of the Andhra dynasty. If Nandārāja named in Khāravela's inscription is identified with the only Nandārāja known to Indian literature, and not with Nandivardhana of Śiśunāga's line, his having excavated a canal three hundred years earlier brings down the date of Khāravela to about the same time.

2. *tato lekha-rupa-ganaṇā-vevahāra-vidhi-visāradēna sava-vij-āvadātena nava-vasāni Yovarājam pasāsitaṁ* (line 2).

Mr. Jayaswal translates, "And after having thoroughly learnt royal correspondence, currency, state-accounting, municipal law, and dharma-injunctions, and having been accomplished in all the *vidyās* (arts), ruled for nine years in the office of Yuva-rāja."

The translator writes in "A Further Note": "*Lekha-rūpa-ganaṇā*, coming just before 'law' and after the fifteenth year, cannot refer to the 'three R's' as supposed by Dr. Bühler" (J.B. & O.R.S., p. 481, 1917). Dr. V. A. Smith lends his support to Mr. Jayaswal's translation as against Bühler, as well as against Bhagavanlal Indraji, who renders *rūpa* as "painting". But Mr. Jayaswal himself is in error in treating *lekha-rupa-ganaṇā-vevahāra-vidhi-visāradēna* and *sava-vij-āvadātena* as if they were participles meaning "during this period (from the sixteenth to the twenty-fourth year), that is, after the fifteenth year (*tato*) he (Khāravela) learnt *lekha-rupa-*

*ganaṇā-vevahāra*". Both these compounds are ordinary adjectives, and the passage may be literally rendered thus: "Then (after the fifteenth year) the dominion of the heir-apparent was ruled for nine years (by the glorious Khāravēla), who was skilful in writing (*lekha*), *rūpa*, arithmetic (*ganaṇā*), and judicial procedure, and was well versed in all the arts and sciences." The text here rather shows that Khāravēla learnt all these arts and sciences before he assumed the office of the heir-apparent after his fifteenth year. So Bühler, who knew the *Dharma-sūtras*, though not the *Artha-śāstra* of Kauṭilya, cannot be declared quite wrong. Bhagavanlal's translation of *rūpa* as "painting" also deserves some consideration. Mr. Jayaswal dismisses this interpretation with the remark "But I do not know that the word is ever used in that sense" (J.B. & O.R.S., p. 461, note 95, 1917). The term *rūpa* is clearly used in the sense of *sculpture* in an inscription on the south gate of Sāñchī Stūpa I (*rūpakamṃa*, Lüders' *List*, No. 345) and in an inscription on the Bharhut rail (*rūpakāraka*, Lüders' *List*, No. 857). It is probably used in the sense of painting in the Rāmgārḥ (Jogimara) cave inscription (*lupadukha* = *rūpaduksha*, Lüders' *List*, No. 921).

3. *sāv=ūyāna-paṭisaṃh[ā]panam ca kārayatī panatisāhi sata-suhasehi pakātīyo ca raṃjayatī* (lines 3-4).

Mr. Jayaswal's *pakātīyo* is an improvement upon Bhagavanlal's *pakāṭīye*. But it is not possible to agree with him, as Dr. V. A. Smith does, in his taking *panatisāhi satasahasēhi* as an adjective qualifying *pakātīyō*, "people." *Pakātīyō* is nominative plural and *panatasāhi satasahasēhi* is instrumental plural. In an elaborate piece of composition like the Hāthigumphā inscription, which is rightly called a *gadya-kāvya*, or an "ornate prose-poem", by Lüders<sup>1</sup> we cannot expect such

<sup>1</sup> *Bruchstücke Buddhistischer Dramen*, Berlin, 1911, p. 62.

an irregularity. Mr. Jayaswal's main reason for doing so is thus stated by him: "If Bhagavanlal had noticed the stop before *panatisāhi*, he would not have connected 'the 35 hundred thousands' with the preceding sentence and taken it to denote the cost of the repairs" (J.B. & O.R.S., p. 402, note 102, 1907). By "stop" Mr. Jayaswal means some space. If there is a little space left between *kārayati* and *panatisāhi*, there is also a little space left between *satasahasēhi* and *pakātīyo*, or, as I would prefer to read, *pakitīyō*, as the facsimile shows. With *rañjayati* (in line 4) comes to an end a long sentence that begins with *abhisita-mato* in line 3 and contains an account of the events of the first year after the installation. There is as much, or as little, space left between *abhisita-mato* and *pāpunāti* that precedes it as there is between *sahasēhi* and *pakitīyo*. So interspacing cannot be assumed to override grammar. Thirty-five hundred thousand evidently is the total sum spent by Khāravela in public works in the first year after his installation. Bhagavanlal's interpretation still stands, even if we take *panatisāhi salasahasēhi* with the verb *rañjayati* instead of with *kārayati*; for Khāravela pleased his subjects by spending this sum in works of public utility.

RAMĀPRASĀD CHANDA.

Dr. Vincent Smith sends us the following note: For further elucidation of the text and translation of the inscription see Mr. Jayaswal's important article entitled "Hāthigumphā Inscriptions revised from the Rock" in *J.B. & O. Res. Soc.*, vol. iv, pp. 364-403. I still agree with Mr. Jayaswal that the record is dated in the year 164 (expired) of the Maurya era.





## NOTICES OF BOOKS

---

THE BOOK OF DUARTE BARBOSA. Vol. I. Translated from the Portuguese text, first published in 1812. . . . Edited and annotated by M. L. DAMES. London: Hakluyt Society. 1918.

This new edition of Barbosa is thoroughly justified by the accuracy of the translation and the great value of the numerous notes which illuminate the text in an extraordinary degree. The Oriental scholarship, the historical, geographical, and numismatic knowledge displayed by Mr. Dames, taken with his power of patient research, make his work of the greatest value to all students of the doings of Europeans in India and the Nearer East in the earlier days of their excursions into Eastern lands. As a brother editor for the Hakluyt Society of records of the century following that in which Barbosa lived, I have some experience of the puzzles of all kinds that are before anyone who undertakes to edit the writings of the old travellers, if he would really elucidate the text before him, and I cannot help expressing my admiration of the manner in which Mr. Dames has faced and overcome those that confronted him in this work. When we consider that Barbosa wrote early in the sixteenth century, almost at the commencement of Portuguese enterprise in the East, that his book begins with a description of the east coast of Africa from the Cape to Suez, and proceeds down the Arabian side of the Red Sea, round to the Persian Gulf, up the Gulf and down again, and then round to the Indies, and thence onwards down the west coast of India to Mangalor in this first volume, one can grasp something of the variety of language, history, and geography that had to be encountered, and the vast range

of the research necessary to properly explain the statements in the text with anything like scholarly, and therefore useful, accuracy. Mr. Dames has met all his difficulties in a way that has been of the highest service to myself at all events, and it is a matter of much regret to me that my own forthcoming volume (iii) on Peter Mundy's travels in the early seventeenth century, covering a little of Barbosa's ground, is too far advanced in the press to enable me to utilize his notes.

Before going further into the contents of this volume, I will at once mention what appear to me to be two blemishes. The first I take as serious. Vol. I has no index, as that is to appear with Vol. II. Now Hakluyt volumes have a way of following each other at a considerable distance of time, and until a complete index can appear any given volume is largely useless to students. One has to read right through it and take notes before one can find a reference to that which one wants to know. For instance, there is a valuable note in this volume on the term "camlet," which I had marked for my personal information and guidance, and having lost the reference, have had to look through the book again to find it! There are many other such notes which scholars will have to wait for till the index appears. I feel sure that in the circumstances in which Hakluyt volumes are published it is best to issue an index with each one as it is printed.

The second defect is in the printing of the notes. Here I think Mr. Dames has been badly served. The printing here reminds one of an Indian press production. The diacritically marked consonants to transliterate Oriental letters and sounds have been too much for the printers and give the notes in many places an untidy appearance.

For the reason I have given above I have carefully read this volume from end to end, and the first thing that

strikes me is the closeness of comparison between Barbosa, the Portuguese traveller of the sixteenth century, and Peter Mundy, the English traveller of the seventeenth century. They had both the same spirit of travel, the same capacity for observation, the same command of the Oriental languages they met with, the same interest in the places they visited and the people among whom they were thrown, the same determination to record only what they saw and knew fairly, the same aloofness in their writings from current squabbles (and these were always in those days incessant and insistent), the same caution as to vouching for what they only heard, and, considering the times in which they lived and the people for whom they wrote, the same breadth of view. Both were, in fact, products of that spirit of inquiry into man and his ways that has produced the modern anthropologist. The result is they have preserved records of value for all time. And if I may say so, their remarks present to their editors much the same kind of puzzles to unravel.

Mr. Dames has brought out the special geographical and ethnographical value of Barbosa's work in a careful introduction, in the course of which he draws attention to a point that is worth general notice. How did the Portuguese and their followers in the East manage to communicate so easily with the natives of India and the East generally? The explanation is the presence about the Indian and Eastern coasts in their day of a large number of *mamlūks*, "captives from the races subdued or raided by the Muhammadans, some of them Europeans," who followed their original masters as slaves, when these found their way across the seas to India and the East as adventurers. Many of the *mughrabīs* or Western captives spoke Spanish, and many Spaniards and Portuguese at that period could talk Arabic, and hence from the outset there was ease of communication between the first of the Portuguese travellers with the Indian peoples through

such interpreters. Barbosa, who was for years on the west coast of Southern India, Knew Malayālam well, and others learnt other vernaculars at least colloquially. By Mundy's time Portuguese and *mestiços* (half-castes) were the ordinary interpreters in practically all the languages the English came across. Mundy himself knew Spanish and soon learnt Portuguese too. He had an extraordinarily accurate ear, and made determined attempts, more or less successful, at every language he met with. One of his merchant companions to the Far East, Thomas Robinson, was an accomplished interpreter in Portuguese. It was in this way that the early wanderers managed to learn so much with considerable accuracy of the people they were thrown with, and to conduct their commercial affairs with the skill they so constantly exhibited.

It was this linguistic knowledge also, this ability to understand clearly what was said to him, that enabled a man like Barbosa to distinguish between races, to know the difference between Turks, Mamlūks, Arabs, Persians, Khurāsānīs, and Turkomāns; to distinguish between Arabic, Turkish, and Gujarātī as spoken on the Indian western coast, and to recognize the existence of the Navāyats, the Indo-Arab *mestiços* or half-castes of the coast. His capacity to converse familiarly with the natives in the South enabled him to learn about the different kingdoms and rulers on the coast and inland, and to learn much about the Hindus and their customs, and to differentiate between sects of them in some instances. Perhaps the most interesting point in this respect is that the first Portuguese knowledge of the Delhi Sultanate of Barbosa's time was through the distorted reports of wandering Hindu *jogīs* driven from the North to the South by the Muhammadan usurpers of the Northern kingdoms.

The geographical and historical notes given us with

a lavish hand by Mr. Dames are valuable beyond measure and are too numerous to notice except here and there. Among the very many places he mentions in them I venture to suggest that such variations of name as Benametapa, Benomotapa, Monomotapa, for the same place on the East African coast, may be due to the inflection of the root in the indigenous premutative languages taking place at the commencement of their words, and that accordingly it is in the last syllables thereof that the true sense or form is to be sought. The remarks on the Island of San Lourenço (St. Lawrence of the early English sailors) or Madagascar are most interesting and go partly to account for the culture found among the modern Malagasy. For the benefit of further students of that island and its history, I would refer them to the volumes of the *Antananarivo Annual*, an excellent publication.

Among many another valuable suggestion, Mr. Dames has one that the name Guardafui for the well-known cape at the African end of the Red Sea may be of Persian and not Arab origin and may mean Gard-i-Hafun, the turn or bend of Hāfun, which is worth consideration.

After following the coast beyond Guardafui to Suez and down again to Aden, Barbosa and contemporary writers and map-makers get much confused as to the order in which the ports and the prominent features of the coast occur, and some of them are guilty of duplicating the same name under allied forms. It is here that they are difficult to follow, and the elucidation of their statements requires much patience and skill.

As a hint to those engaged in research as to these coasts, such terms in Portuguese as Mafamede for Muhammad, Rosalgate for Rāsa'l-hadd, Coquiar for Sohar, should keep one always on the look out for forms that Arabic  $\tau$  and  $\tau$  may assume in transference to

Portuguese and Spanish, and hence to other European tongues. The Portuguese *c* for *s* in Sohar represents *ç*, the cedilla being often left out in MSS. This habit has led to many mistakes and the student should always be wary. Barbosa's Coracones (Corações) for Khurāsānīs is a good instance, as it induced Ramusio to write Coracanis, an impossible form of the Persian original. The Portuguese *x* for the sound of English *sh* gives Oriental names and words a curious appearance to English eyes (e.g. Xeques = Sheikhs), but it need never mislead them.

When the traveller gets about the region of Ormuz, identifications, both within and without the Persian Gulf, become very difficult and uncertain. Much closer knowledge than we at present possess is necessary here and may now, in some degree, become possible as a by-product of the Great War. The geographical difficulties met with are well explained by Mr. Dames, and so are some of the historical puzzles. To Barbosa and the Portuguese of his day the great Shāh Isma'il of Persia, the overlord of all the neighbourhood of the Gulf, was known as Xequé (Sheikh) Ismael, in allusion to the then recent origin of his family. Mr. Dames speaks of him as Isma'il Shāh, but, as I understand, he and all his successors in the Safavī Dynasty were known as Shāh Isma'il, Shāh Tahmasp (the "Great Sophy" of Elizabeth's time), Shāh 'Abbās, and so on, in contradistinction to the Aga Muhammad Shāh, Fatteh 'Alī Shāh, and so on, of the latest and present Kājār Dynasty of Persia. Mr. Dames rightly points out that Shāh Isma'il was of no mean descent, as his opponents made out. His father was the great Shī'a saint (Sheikh Saifu'ddīn Izhāk of Ardabil), and his grandfather the still greater Sheikh Haidar Sūfī, lineal descendant of the seventh Imām, Mūsā al-Kāzīm, the outcome of whose teaching was a division of Muhammadanism vitally momentous to the

world of Islām. His mother was Martha, the daughter of the then recent and important Turkomān ruler, as I understand, of the Akkuyunlu (White Sheep Standard) Tribes, and not of the Kārakuyunlu (Black Sheep Standard), as Mr. Dames has it, known as Uzūn Hasan (Long Hasan) among many other names, by Despoina, the Christian daughter of the Emperor John Comnenus (Calo Johannes) of Trebizond, in Asia Minor. Isma'il was thus a Shī'a, a Sūfī, and a Persian of high descent, and it was this fact, coupled with his personal qualities and his championship of the Shī'a faith, that made him so popular a candidate for the Persian throne. It says much for Barbosa's accuracy of information that he correctly states that Shāh Isma'il was almost uniformly successful in his wars, though he was defeated at the great battle of Khōi (1514) by the Sunnī Sultān of Constantinople, Selim I, through the latter's then novel use of artillery.

Leaving Ormuz, Barbosa takes us to India proper at Diul or Diulḡinde, as the Portuguese called the port of Deval in Sindh (the Arabic Daybul), on the then western branch of the Indus Delta. On this Mr. Dames has a good note. He then passes on to Gujarāt, or Kingdom of Guzarate as he calls it. This is remarkable, as it was then usual to call it Cambaya or Cambay, through Arabic Kambāyat, from its principal seaport, but Barbosa knew that the Kingdom of Cambaya belonged to the King of Guzerate, thus again showing accuracy of information. He describes its people as Resbutos or Rājṡpṡts, thus commencing a series of corruptions of that much abused name; Baneanes (Baniāns, Baniās) or traders, meaning thereby Jain traders from his description of them, and Bramenes or Brāhmanas. He thus got the main divisions of the Hindus fairly accurately, and the order in which he places them is interesting, as showing how they appeared to rank in the eyes of the earliest European



visitors to the country. The lower classes he calls Pateles from the title *patēl*, assumed by certain low castes for their subdivisions. Mr. Dames remarks that "it is probable that some men of these castes acted as messengers for the Brāhmanas in Barbosa's time". Barbosa's description of the Muhammadan and cosmopolitan side of the populations of Cambay is equally discriminating.

Of inland cities, there is a description of Chāmpānēr (Barbosa's Champanel), then an important mint town of the Muhammadan kings of Gujarāt, and of Ahmadābād, under the name of Andava.

A large port called Pateney is then reached, which Mr. Dames conjectures to be Somnāth. The name is somewhat of a puzzle. This is followed soon afterwards by a description of Dio (Diu) and its relations with the Portuguese, and of Barbasy, apparently the modern Bhaunagar. Then comes Guindarim in the land of dangerous tides, which is most interesting, as it represents Ghandhār, the Kandahār of many a North Indian legend, unless indeed by the Kandahār of the northern bards is really meant the old land of Gandhāra about Peshāwar. After a short account of "the fair city of Cambaya" and its luxury, follow two notices, with important notes attached, of Limadura and Reynel. The first is the place where the carnelians of commerce came from, and Mr. Dames identifies it with Limodra on the banks of the Narbada near Ratanpur in the Rājpipla State. The second is the town known in the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries as Reynel, Ravel, Reiner, Reniel, Rancile, Ro Neal, and so on, on the Tāptī, near Sūrat. This Mr. Dames shows to be the old town of Randēr. It was the home of wealthy Indo-Arab half-breeds called Momins, Navāyatās, Nāyatās, Naiteas, and Naites, whose luxurious ways Barbosa notices.

Sūrat is briefly noticed as Çurate, while the neighbouring province of Sorath is called Çuriate, and then

follow short accounts of Dinuy (Dāmān) and Baxay (Vasāi, Baçaim, Bassein), and Tana-Majambu, an odd name for Thāna, as to which Mr. Dames has an interesting conjecture. By the way, many years ago I wrote an article in the *Indian Antiquary*, vol. xxii, pp. 18-21, showing that there are now three postal towns in India and Burma all called Bassein by us, none of which are so known to the natives of the neighbourhood. Bassein, in Bombay, is Vasāi; Bassein, in Berar, is Bāsim or Wāsim; Bassein, in Burma, is known to the Burmans as Pathōng and to the Talaings of the neighbourhood as Pasēm or Pasīm. I was moved thereto by my letters when at Bassein in Burma, being constantly and unnecessarily sent elsewhere.

Barbosa's next description is of the "Daquem Kingdom", the Deccan, where the Bāhmanīs of Kulbarga and Bidar still ruled in name, and the 'Adilshāhī Dynasty of Bijapūr was the virtual power on the coast. After noticing several ports along the coast, he comes to "the River of Betele and the towns thereon", which last Mr. Dames identifies with Vijaydrug, "one of the best harbours on the west coast of India," on the Vāghotān River, in the Ratnagiri District. Here is given an accurate description of "betel" (*pān-supūrī*) both as to its nature and its use. Vengorla is noticed under the name of Banda, which takes our traveller to the Portuguese province of Bardes and Goa.

Goa naturally yields a long description and some excellent annotations, especially that upon the Sindābūr of the Arab geographers, which Mr. Dames shows to be more applicable to the neighbouring Cintacora of Barbosa on the River Liga or Kālinadī than to Goa as Yule supposed. Another valuable note shows how the founder of the 'Adilshāhī Dynasty, the Kurd *mamlūk*, Yūsuf 'Adil Khān (Ydalcām of the Portuguese) came to be known as the Sabayo. Very interesting also is Barbosa's description of the tongues spoken at Goa in his time,

"Arabic, Persian, and Daquanim, which is the native tongue of the land." Daquanim stands here for "Dakhanī, the language of the Deccan, that is, Marāthī". Nowadays it stands for a variety of Urdu, the first form of that *lingua franca* which the present writer learnt to his much trouble afterwards.

Barbosa then enters "the Kingdom of Narsingua", that is, of Vijayanagar, so named by the Portuguese after Narsingha, the name of its ruler when they first arrived. Its capital was Bisnagua, Vijayanagar, through the popular form Bijanagar. He describes it as of "five vast provinces", with Tolinate (Tulunāda) the land of the Tuluvas, along the coast. He shows that he could distinguish between the Telugu, Canarese, and Tamil languages, and calls the Eastern province Charamandel, which is nearer to the native Cholamandalam than our own Coromandel. Passing by Honor (Honāwar, *anglice* Onore), he notes on the pirates of his day and then reaches Baticala (Bhatkal), where a century later Courteen's Expedition attempted to start an English factory, as is described at length by Peter Mundy. The space given by Barbosa to Bhatkal is much larger than usual, and there is a remarkable description of rice planting in its neighbourhood. A statement in the text also leads to a useful note on the use of the term "India" by the Portuguese to describe only Goa and their first settlements. With Bracalor, which, with the restoration of the cedilla, can be shown to be the Canarese Basarūru, Arabicized into Abu Sarūr by Ibn Batūta, and a description of Mangalor, taken from Ramusio's text, the itinerary ends.

The volume winds up with, for the time, an extraordinarily accurate description of the Vijayanagar Empire and its capital and of the manners of its people, due no doubt to Barbosa's knowledge of Malayālam and possible bowing acquaintance with Canarese and Tamil. He must

have seen both the kingdom and the capital at their best, as they were then under the greatest of their rulers, Krishna Deva Rayya. Especially valuable is the account of the Lingayats and their customs, the description of *sati* by burning and burial alive (Lingāyat), of hook-swinging, and of the King's method of collecting an army and going to war with enormous impedimenta.

Finally, there are two short notices from hearsay of Orissa and Delhi, in which Barbosa discloses that his information came from wandering *jōgīs*, jogues or çoamerques (*suāmi-rikhi*) as he calls them. These he describes at length, obviously from personal acquaintance. This description gives Mr. Dames an opportunity for a fine note on the bezoar stone carried by the "jogues", as the wind-up of this very valuable work.

Incidentally, many matters of great interest to the student of things Oriental are to be found in Mr. Dames's notes. Owing to the want of an index, I have noted down a number of these for my own use, and some of them are of general interest also. For instance, his remarks on the early mistake of the Portuguese that the Hindus were some kind of Christians from a very cursory observation of their religious observances; and his frequent remarks on the persistent and successful attempts of the Portuguese to stop the Indian trade with the West *viâ* the Red Sea with the object of diverting it into their own hands by the long sea route. Their advent must indeed have been a crushing blow to the prosperity of the Arabian seaboard, and its effect on the peoples thereon is evidenced by the serious, though ineffectual, attempts of the Mamlūk Sultān of Egypt on his own behalf to drive out the Portuguese by an expedition to the Indian sea-coast itself. Indeed, the situation created by European aggression in regard to the ancient Indo-Arabian trade is quite pathetic.

A most interesting survival of the Portuguese days in

India is pointed out in the use of the term "Canarim" (Canarin) or Canarese for "Eurasian", resulting in the well-known Anglo-Indian metathesized expression Karānī, degenerating in many places into a vernacular term for any kind of native or Eurasian clerk.

Occasionally Mr. Dames passes over Indian expressions without comment, e.g. Gingelly oil, and on p. 90 he has no explanation of what is referred to by the fish at Basra, "which, the more they are boiled, or roasted, the more they bleed." Nor does he explain what kind of a shore boat is meant by the term "terada" beyond a reference on p. 97 to the *Commentaries*; and as he has a note on the "Turkish" composite bow and says it is still made on the Indian frontiers, it is a pity he does not explain what kind of a bow it is.

The vagueness of the term "India" as used by the Portuguese comes out clearly when among the imports into Diul (in Sindh) are mentioned "certain canes which are found in India and are of the thickness of a man's leg". The reference is, of course, to the Giant Bamboo, and "India" must be the Malabar Coast, or Burma, or the Malay Archipelago. On the "rhubarb of Babylonia" Mr. Dames has an illuminating note (pp. 93-4). "Scarlet-in-grain" is a term which Mr. Dames has used several times, meaning thereby apparently cloth dyed scarlet, but it puzzles me, owing to a statement on p. 129, "cloth of scarlet-in-grain and other colours," because I have preached on evidence over and over again that "scarlet" in the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries was not a "colour" but a "cloth", and that the exclusive use of the term for a colour came later. One hears of "scarlet" of all colours in the earlier days. On p. 10 there is an interesting statement as to the "Heathen whom the Moors name Cafres", meaning the inhabitants of South Africa (Zulus and Bantus), and showing the origin of the term Kāfir as applied to any "Heathen" and of the spelling "Cafre".

Mr. Dames is always valuable when dealing with numismatics, and I personally am grateful for his remarks on "cruzado" (p. 65), on "pardao" (p. 191), and on the coinage of Ormus (pp. 99-100), and for his note on weights and measures on p. 157, and on "sardo, farden", meaning a bundle (p. 194). He will have others to compare them with in my forthcoming volume of Peter Mundy.

The bulk of Mr. Dames's miscellaneous notes are naturally in explanation of the Portuguese forms of Oriental terms found in the text; in fact, of Hobson-Jobsons. Many of these are very valuable to the student, and some are new to myself. I think I have marked them all for reference, but I would note a few here. The term *almadia* (p. 14) for a canoe was carried to the Indian coast, as was noted by Mandelslo. The origin of *assegai* is explained as the Port. *azagaia* for Berber *zaghaya*. There are, too, a series of notes on *alequequa* and *babagoure* for carnelian and chalcedony, and on the chalcedony mines of Limodra in the Rajpipla State (pp. 137 and 144). And, further, there is a neat note explaining how the Indian term Deccan (Dakhim, Dakhan), the Kingdom on the right-hand, i.e. the Southern Kingdom, became to the Portuguese, Daquem, D'aquem, the Kingdom on this side, the Hither Kingdom, by pure folk-etymology. Attention is also drawn to the *r* in "lacquer" (lac) and in *almiscar* (musk), which is absent in the original vernacular (p. 56).

One could go on almost indefinitely on the etymological notes, but I will content myself with expressing gratitude for the notes on "camlet" (woollen) and "cambolin" and "cameline" (cotton) cloths (pp. 63, 93, 120), though I doubt if *tafeta* ever meant anything but a silk cloth, and I should like to see proof that it was at any time a mixture of camlet and silk (p. 93). Especially am I grateful for an explanation of *Sinzi* brocades and

*Jannābiya* cloth (p. 79); and on p. 124 there is a note worth quoting: "The word *grão* (*gram* in the old spelling) is almost always used in the sense of the red dye (not really a grain). The use of the word *gram* (pronounced as an English word) to denote the chick-pea (*Cicer arietinus*) is modern. For this Barbosa employed the word *chicharo* (*chicharro* in modern spelling), the correct Portuguese name for this pea." Incidentally, a note on p. 131 points out that a very early, if not the earliest, use of *casta* in Portuguese for the modern term "caste" is in Correa, i, p. 746: "Melequiaz [Malik Ayyāz] was a foreigner, a Moor, a Jao [Javanese] by caste." On p. 206 there is a valuable note on "umbrella" and the various terms in European languages therefor, and on p. 218 another on *tambarane*, the portable *lingam* worn by Lingāyats.

Barbosa winds up this volume with a long note on *Jogues*, or, as the copyist has it, *Jones*! And here I propose to leave him with my congratulations to Mr. Dames for his version and his annotations.

R. C. TEMPLE.

THE DANCE OF SIVA. Fourteen Indian Essays. The Sunwise Turn, Inc. 2, East 31st Street, New York, 1918.

*The Dance of Siva* is a very interesting and informative volume, for which we have to thank our Cingalese Fellow, Dr. Coomaraswamy, now Curator of the Arts Museum in Boston, U.S.A.

The essays may be roughly said to fall into three groups: those that deal chiefly with philosophical problems, with art in the concrete, and those that are partly political and partly ethical, relating to such subjects as the status of women in India and the result of the industrialism introduced by ourselves.

In relation to the last theme, our author holds with those who regret this innovation. He considers that the future lies with the party that shall frankly admit the great debt of Europe to India. There should, he says, be a cessation of the foolish attempts to upset the caste system, which has its roots deep in the Indian character. There should be more encouragement of the ancient manner of conducting life. If we push industrialism too far, we may see ourselves threatened with competition of a disastrous nature from those whom we have forced out of their ancient ways of thought. In this connexion we meet the view that there is a hierarchy of age among souls—the youthful soul seeks power and fame; the ancient, like that of Christ and Buddha, aims at an ethical ideal. But granting an age hierarchy, how are we to get over the difficulty of the creation? Are we to suppose that souls have been gradually evolved from matter, one by one? The Vedantic view would not, I think, chime with this; it maintains that all souls were equally divine and eternal. The difference in degree of sanctity would depend exclusively upon difference of true knowledge.

There are some interesting remarks upon Yoga, and I am disposed to agree with the author in considering that the Yogis have obtained, by mental concentration, certain powers altogether unknown to the Western world, save exoterically through the study of Yoga. It appears to be the opinion of experts that the path of Yoga is not the only or the best method of obtaining true knowledge.

I omit here the arguments upon the nature of the æsthetic act, which I discussed when reading the paper. But the student would do well to consult this work upon the subject and to supplement it from the Western point of view with the *Aesthetic* of B. Croce. There is general agreement as to the nature of the act, though the first



complete scientific formulation appears to have been that of Croce. Dr. Coomaraswamy has profited by the study of the *Aesthetic*, from which he quotes, and his natural love for the writers of India perhaps tends to induce a larger claim for consciousness on their part of the full independence of the æsthetic activity than future criticism will be inclined to admit.

The essay upon the dance of Siva gives its title to the volume and is accompanied by one of the most beautiful of the many interesting illustrations. It is taken from a Brahmanical bronze of the twelfth century, from Southern India. Here we see Siva in his character of Natarājā. The image represents the god dancing, his hair braided and adorned with jewels (I quote or summarize from our author). He has four arms to denote his capacity for attaining that which he wishes. A cobra and the mermaid figure of Ganga writhe in his hair. Upon it rests a crescent moon and it is crowned with a wreath of cassia leaves. In his right ear he wears a man's earring, a woman's in his left . . . he is adorned with necklaces and armlets, a jewelled belt, anklets, bracelets, armlets, and toe-rings. His scarf and sacred thread flutter in the wind. One of the right hands holds a drum, the other is uplifted in the sign of "Do not fear". One of the left hands holds fire, the other is pointed downwards to the dwarf Mulayaka, who holds a cobra, and the left foot is raised. From this foot springs a flame in the shape of an encircling glory.

The interpretation of the dance is very interesting. Siva is the Lord, the dancer who diffuses his power everywhere and makes all dance to the tune of the five activities. These are creation, destruction, or evolution, preservation, veiling or the giving of rest, and release or salvation. This dance, therefore, represents the cosmic activity.

The ideas here represented in art are profound. For

destruction, to cite an instance, must not be taken as the material destruction of the heavens and the earth alone, but also of the fetters that bind the human soul to the laws of birth and change.

I omit here the criticism of this profound symbolism underlying so much of Indian art, and pass to the brief mention of the illustrations of the sublime Buddhas and Bhodisattvas that are to be found in the volume. Notable even among these, is that of the Buddha, in the trance known as Samadhi, a state in which nothing belonging to the external world has any longer any significance.

Other illustrations of value and interest are those of the Buddhist Primitives in the Ajanta Caves and elsewhere.

In my lecture followed the development of the comparative criticism of Hellenic art as manifested in the Gandhara period and the previous achievements of Indian art, coming to a like conclusion with our author that the art of India was in full vigour long before the Greek invasion, and that Indian thought had not been proved to be derivative from Greek thought, though no doubt, when the Indian mind became first acquainted with the system of Aristotle, it was stimulated to creative criticism of the discoveries of that philosopher. I believe there is something very like telepathy in the highest realms of thought; otherwise it is difficult to account for the contemporary blossoming of theories, in lands far apart, before the existence of means of easy communication.

In the matter of the Indian images with many arms, the author was found to be right in his complaint of the treatment meted out to them by such writers as Sir George Birdwood, who refers to the *clumsiness* of expressing the idea of power by deities with many arms or heads. The really important thing is to recognize the *thought* that is behind the phenomena. To accept the

standard of recognition as the criterion of taste in art is rightly held to be a negation of the freedom of thought upon which art lives. Every world of art must be judged by the world of thought which it represents. We do not know, for instance, that men have two eyes, though a considerable number of those we have seen appear to possess them. I believe that an anatomist will tell you that the pineal gland represents a third eye, though this in turn does not prove that man is a being with three eyes.

I omit my remarks upon the chapter upon Indian music and its modes, which is one of the most stimulating in the volume.

The article upon Indian woman takes the view that with the Western, rights are in the minds of everybody; with the Indian, duties. There does not exist in India that craving for personal satisfaction, as apart from the perfect performance of duty, which prevails with us.

Dr. Coomaraswamy attacks the romantic marriage, which he holds to be a failure, in so far as the attainment of perfect spiritual and physical intercourse is concerned. That this may occasionally be attained is not denied; but the fact is that marriage becomes with many a heavy bond. Those who are crossed in love do not marry at all. The corollary to that should be that those who no longer love should no longer remain married.

The ingenuity of the argument would render cogent its results, were the whole of the facts included in the premises, but although the majority of our marriages *are* based upon reciprocity of sentiment, yet the immense majority find the arrangement to their liking.

In the East, marriage is rather the result of vocation than of sentiment. According to the code of Manu, the wife should look upon her husband as a god, and it would be beneath her dignity as a wife to deflect from the correct course of conduct, because of the bad conduct

of her husband. She has her part to play for the sake of the children. It is therefore dangerous to educate Indian women on the same lines as the social-democratic women of the West. Happiness at Hampstead does not suit the Tropic of Capricorn. The object of the Eastern woman is not to *express* herself by means of the ballot-box or the cut of her bloomers, but to *realize* herself. What passes for education here, such as a little French, and playing the fiddle or the piano a little, would be looked upon as ridiculous in the East, where everything is professionalized, and no one would think of sitting down to entertain a company with music or acting, unless he were a professional. It has been ascertained that 75 per cent of the American graduate women do not marry, which (I am all along quoting our author) simply means that if the same education is to be extended to all, we shall eventually be faced with extinction.

I just mention the discussion upon the abolition of the act of Sati, which in the spirit of a true reactionary, our author deploras. I must say, however, that he adduces some remarkable instances of extreme desire and persistence on the part of women who have wished to be burned with the dead bodies of their husbands. Sir F. Halliday is quoted, who narrates how, after he had reasoned for some time with one of the widows, he was asked to send for a candle. She placed her finger in the flame and held it there until it was burned and twisted like a quill pen. All the time she gave no evidence of any fear or pain. Her wish was then granted. This, of course, was prior to the abolition in 1829. The act of Sati is essentially a feminine and not a masculine institution. In the Indian view the qualities of man and woman are incommensurable. They hold that for the greatest fruition of life there should be the greatest differentiation of sex.

DOUGLAS AINSLEE.

THE OXFORD HISTORY OF INDIA, FROM THE EARLIEST TIMES TO THE END OF 1911. By VINCENT A. SMITH, C.I.E., Litt.D. Oxford: Clarendon Press. 1919. 12s. 6d. net.

Possibly some readers will commence the perusal of this work with a feeling of doubt whether there is really a need for yet another summary of the history of India; but if so, that doubt will quickly vanish. The Preface claims that "no book on lines at all similar is in existence", and that it provides "a compendious up-to-date history of India as a whole, based on the results of modern research"; and these contentions, in the opinion of one reader at least, are fully made good.

Dr. Vincent Smith is too well known to members of the Royal Asiatic Society for any reminder to be necessary regarding the qualifications he has brought to the task he has undertaken. Apart from his official experience of the country, which forms a valuable asset, he has paid attention to Indian history for nearly half a century; while the long list of his previous works on the subject shows the wide range of his studies. The first 216 pages of the present volume, dealing with the Hindu period, are naturally a summary of his well-known *Early History of India*, supplemented (and occasionally corrected) from the results of more recent research. In treating of the Muhammadan period, which occupies the next 250 pages, he is similarly able to use for the reign of Akbar his admirable monograph on that monarch; while in the other portions he has evidently taken great pains to give a full account from original authorities, some of which have only lately become accessible. The rest of the volume (about 320 pages) is devoted to the British period, which, as the author observes, "offers less opportunity for novelty or originality of treatment"; yet he manages to make even this well-worn subject attractive by the use of apt quotations, by bringing forward many forgotten but

useful details, and by his pungent criticisms of men and measures.

The value of the work is much enhanced by the addition of 24 maps and plans and of 179 well-chosen illustrations. Many of the latter are excellent; others suffer from being printed on the thin paper which it was necessary to use. Some errors of date, etc., occur in the text; but this is inevitable in a volume of over 800 closely-printed pages, covering so large a period, and they will doubtless be corrected in the new edition which is sure to be wanted before long. The author will probably also expand his useful lists of authorities, in which at present we miss several works which seem to have a claim to mention. These, however, are but trifling blemishes in what may be unreservedly praised as a sound and useful piece of work, which is sure of a warm welcome from the ever-widening circle of students of Indian history.

W. F.

- 
1. THE SĀMKHYA SYSTEM, A HISTORY OF THE SĀMKHYA PHILOSOPHY. By A. BERRIEDALE KEITH, D.C.L., D.Litt. (The Heritage of India Series.) pp. 109. Calcutta and London, Mysore printed [1918]. 12°.
  2. STUDIES IN EARLY INDIAN THOUGHT. By DOROTHEA JANE STEPHEN. pp. i, 176. University Press, Cambridge, 1918. 12°.

Professor Keith, following the historical order of development, begins his work with an analysis of those philosophical ideas expressed in the Upaniṣads which may be regarded as forerunners of the principles of the classical Sāṅkhya. He then proceeds to a comparison of Sāṅkhya and Buddhism, and after this to an examination of the Sāṅkhya as it is propounded in the Mahābhārata. Chapter v sets forth what is known about the rather

mysterious Śaṣṭitantra, which is said to be the basis of the Sāṃkhya-kārikā, and chapter vi briefly disposes of the alleged debts of the philosophers of Greece to the Sāṃkhya. Chapter vii is an exposition of the classic Sāṃkhya as set forth in the Sāṃkhya-kārikā of Īśvara Kṛṣṇa; and this is followed by a sketch of the later developments of the system as represented in the Tattva-samāsa and the Sāṃkhya-sūtra. The learned author's style does not always tend to illuminate the obscurities of his theme, and there is a considerable crop of small misprints in the book; but apart from these minor defects, the work deserves to be welcomed as a scholarly and judicious exposition of the subject.

Miss Stephen's work is of a very different type. In five chapters she sets forth in a lively and interesting style her views on the Vedic and Upaniṣadic conceptions of the Divine nature, on the Upaniṣadic ideas of human nature, on the religious content of the Bhagavad-gītā, and on the special character of early Indian thought as compared with that of the other great nations of ancient times. Her treatment can hardly be said to be profound, and on some points her judgments probably need considerable qualification, but she writes brightly, and often with shrewd insight. Perhaps the least satisfactory part of the book is its treatment of the Bhagavad-gītā. It is surely very hazardous to say, as she does (p. 171), that the *bhakti*-religions arose after the period of the Gītā, and that in them "the passion of the devotee was something apart from conduct", and that "in the long run, the Bhakti religions brought no moral reformation to the country at large". This is hardly just to Tulsī Dās and the other Vaiṣṇava preachers.

L. D. B.

ANNUAL REPORT OF THE MYSORE ARCHÆOLOGICAL DEPARTMENT FOR THE YEAR 1918. By RAO BAHADUR R. NARASIMHACHAR, M.A. Fol.; pp. 71, with 15 plates. Bangalore, 1919.

Year by year, as Rao Bahadur Narasimhachar's Reports appear, the historian, the archæologist, the antiquarian, and the philologist alike welcome them in the hope of finding in them new and precious additions to their knowledge, and in their hope they are never disappointed. The present volume is a record of indefatigable and fruitful work as fine as any of its predecessors, which is saying much. It chronicles a series of tours in the districts of Tumkur, Chitaldrug, Mysore, and Hassan, in the course of which nearly 300 new records were found, and several hitherto unnoticed buildings were examined. Among the more notable structures described here we may mention the temples of Īśvara at Arsikere, Yōga-mādhava at Settikere, Gaḷagēśvara at Heggere, Chenna-kēśava at Aralaguppe, and Varāha-svāmi in Mysore, with the Jamā Masjid and Dargāh of Malik Rihān at Sira, and among the records a stone inscription of the Gaṅga king Śrīpuruṣa at Halkur, with the Śaka date 788, another of the Nolamba Ponnēra at Sravandanhalli, a copper-plate charter of an early Kadamba king named Bhōgivarman, son of Ajavarman, and another purporting to be of the Gaṅga Polavira, son of Nirvinīta, which introduces some new puzzles into the tangled web of Gaṅga historiography.

L. D. B.

---

THE PEARL-STRINGS; A HISTORY OF THE RESŪLIYY DYNASTY OF YEMEN. By 'ALÍYU'BNU-'L-ḤASAN 'EL-KHAZREJYY. Vol. V, containing the second half of the Arabic text. 1918.

With this volume the pious task, undertaken by the Trustees of the Gibb Memorial Fund almost at the



commencement of their operations, of giving to the world the result of the labours of the late Sir James Redhouse on al-Khazraji's *History of the Rasūlī Dynasty in the Yaman*, is now complete. The great Orientalist of the last century, having in 1884 received from the University of Cambridge the honorary degree of Doctor of Letters, resolved to requite the University for its recognition of his achievements by presenting to it, transcribed by himself, the work before us, consisting of a copy of the India Office MS. of al-Khazraji's history (Loth 710), a translation in two volumes, a volume of notes, and another of indices and maps—five in all. The work, as reproduced by the Trustees, also consists of five volumes, two of Arabic text, two of translation, and one of annotations, the maps having been discarded as out of date. The text also is not identical with that deposited by Sir James Redhouse in the Cambridge University Library, which on examination was found to omit large portions of the original MS., chiefly obituary notices of learned men and passages of poetry. On this being discovered, the Trustees obtained a photograph of the original MS., and sent it to Cairo to be put into type at the *Hilāl* Press under the supervision of Shaikh Muḥammad 'Asal, formerly teacher of Arabic at Cambridge. The result of this arrangement cannot be described as satisfactory. The text of the Arabic volumes swarms with misprints, only a small fraction of which is corrected in the tables of *errata* prefixed to the fifth volume. The proper names, both of places and persons, have been as far as possible set right by the devoted industry of Dr. R. A. Nicholson, whose indices, covering 166 pages, represent an enormous amount of irksome labour; but innumerable mistakes in other words remain uncorrected, and are a serious drawback to the perusal of the book. The practice of putting into the printer's hands a photograph of an old MS. as press copy seems very unlikely to

lead to good results; and in the present case the editor appears to have taken little pains to supplement the deficiencies of the MS. Sir James Redhouse's translation shows that in a great number of cases he was aware of, and has rendered, the correct reading, while Shaikh Muḥammad 'Asal has left the corrupt text as set up by an illiterate compositor unchanged. Anyone who attempts to read the original must keep Sir James's translation open before him, or he will meet with difficulties on every page.

In the Preface to the last volume Professor Browne has sufficiently dwelt on the shortcomings of the work, and described the field covered by the author. In reading al-Khazraji's history I have, in the midst of much monotony, been agreeably surprised to find many passages of life-like description and shrewd judgment on men and things. The dynasty whose annals he relates, itself of Turkish origin (though claiming to be descended from the royal house of Jafnah, the Kings of Ghassān), occupied the throne of the southern Yaman, with its capital at Zabīd, for a little more than two centuries (1229–1446 A.D.), between the end of the dominion of the Ayyūbites, the descendants of Saladin, in Egypt and its dependencies, and the conquest of Egypt by the Turks under Sultan Salim I in 1517. In the latter part of the time—from 1446 for about seventy years—small local dynasties held different parts of the Yaman; and throughout the history of the Rasūlī kings they were constantly at strife with the Zaidī Imāms in the northern portion of that territory. With the help of the late Mr. H. C. Kay's edition of 'Umārah's *History of the Yaman* and the present work, those who are interested in the vicissitudes of this somewhat outlying corner of the Islamic empire will be able to make themselves acquainted with most of the events which have affected it. It has seldom enjoyed long-continued peace, though it has escaped the cataclysms,

such as the Mongol invasion and the ravages of Timūr, which have swept over the rest of Islām ; but it has been prolific in jurists and men of learning. Among others, the compilers of two of the best-known Arabic lexicons, the *Qāmūs* and the *Tāj al-‘Arūs*, were inhabitants of the Yaman, though both belonged to immigrant families. The author of the first, Majd ad-dīn al-Fairūzābādī, was a Persian from the neighbourhood of Shīrāz, and that of the second, Sayyid Murtaḍā of Zabīd, a member of the Indian family, distinguished in literature, of the Sayyids of Bilgrām in Oudh.

It is interesting to meet, in the midst of a quite modern situation, in a letter from the fallen Amīr Asad ad-dīn to his nephew the Sulṭān Muḍhaffar, with a quotation from a very ancient Arab poet, al-Mumazzaq (translation, i, p. 156 ; text, i, p. 131):—

If I am to be eaten up, be thou my eater ! If not, hasten to my help before I am quite torn in pieces.

The verse is in the *Aṣma‘īyat*, 50, 16 ; Ibn Qutaibah, *Shi‘r*, p. 236.

Except for some slight changes in the orthography of proper names (which might have been carried further with advantage), the introduction, translation, and annotations are published as they were left by Sir James Redhouse. No doubt a thorough revision of his work was scarcely, in the circumstances, to be expected ; and the reader must be left to correct or supplement as required passages which represent views of Oriental history current forty or fifty years ago. But it might have been well to cancel such statements as that on pp. 6 and 18 of the annotations, which identifies the Aretas (the Nabataean king), who was a contemporary of Herod Antipas and St. Paul, with al-Ḥārith the Great of the dynasty of Jafnah or Ghassān ; and that on p. 85, which makes the poet-prince, Imra’ al-Qais, a contemporary of

Muhammad and of the Emperor Heraclius. The dates in the Introduction are also greatly in need of revision.

C. J. L.

---

THE ASTRONOMICAL OBSERVATORIES OF JAI SINGH. By G. R. KAYE, F.R.A.S. Published by the Calcutta Superintendent Printing, India, 1918. Price Rs. 14.12 or 23s.

The royal quarto pages, large type, broad margins, and many illustrations of this magnificent volume issued by the Archæological Survey of India, inspire a feeling of strong envy in those who have come under the restrictions of the Paper Controller in England. India is so far away that Europe sees it—to use an astronomical metaphor—in the conditions of a time before the War. Its subject, too, is very old, in conception though not in actual years, for Jai Singh's five observatories built at Delhi, Jaipur, Benares, Ujjain, and Mathurā, between the dates of our era 1728 and 1734, were posthumous children of the Stone Age. It is with Callanish and Stonehenge, the Tower of Babel and perhaps the Pyramids, that we must rank them, in order to appreciate their standing and purposes, not with the Royal Observatory, Greenwich, or with the great telescopes at Mount Hamilton or Mount Wilson.

Mahārāja Jai Singh was a Sikh by birth, who was appointed by Muhammad Shāh (that is by a Muslim emperor) governor of the province of Agra and later of Malwa, and to Muhammad Shāh he dedicated his great work, the *Zīj Muhammad Shāhī*, which is a translation of Ulugh Beg's great Catalogue of Stars, published in the fourteenth century of our era. In his preface to this work Jai Singh gave as his reasons for founding his stone observatories that at the observatory of Ulugh Beg at Samarqand the "brass instruments did not come up to the ideas which he (Ulugh Beg) had formed of accuracy,

because of the smallness of their size", and "therefore he (Jai Singh) constructed in Dār al-Khilāfat Shāh Jahānābād (Delhi), which is the seat of empire and prosperity, instruments of his own invention, such as Jai Prakas and Rām Yantra and Samrāt Yantra—of stone and lime of perfect stability . . . so that the inaccuracies from the shaking of the circles and the wearing of their axes and displacement of their centres and the inequality of the minutes might be corrected". Jai Singh goes on to say that "by the aid of the unerring artificer, astronomical instruments have been constructed with all the exactness that the heart can desire, and the motions of the stars have for a long period been constantly observed with them . . . he found the calculation to agree perfectly with observation". As a matter of fact there is no indication of how such observations were carried out in practice, nor indeed if the "agreement" of "the motions of the stars" with "observation" is an astronomical agreement, for Jai Singh did not attempt to correct the places of the stars as given in Ulugh Beg's Catalogue, as we would do to-day, and so find their "proper motions". Some of the instruments indeed indicate that the purpose of Jai Singh's "science" was not astronomical but astrological.

Mr. Kaye's treatment of the origins and designs of these Jai Singh stone instruments is exhaustive, but the part of the volume that is perhaps of greatest interest to the student of archæological astronomy relates not to the instruments themselves but to the school of astronomy which influenced the Mahārāja; for he inquired into the Hindu, Muslim, and European schools and rejected the first and last to all intents and purposes. Early Hindu astronomy was largely unreal; it did not depend upon the continued observations of the heavenly bodies, whose relative positions at some time were simply used as marking an epoch to which an *arithmetical* calculation might be

attached. Jai Singh probably never grasped the real character of the European astronomy of his day, nor understood that its purpose was practical and scientific; for "the rectifying the tables of the motions of the heavens, and the places of the fixed stars . . . for the perfecting the art of navigation"; not for providing the means for astrological fortune-telling. The astronomy he accepted was the Arabian based on Ptolemy, and as Mr. Kaye writes on p. 83: "In Europe, after the death of Ptolemy in the second century of our era, very little advance was made for a thousand years. The Christian Church often opposed scientific enlightenment, and sometimes persecuted those who sought it; and the patristic writings contain the grossest of astronomical absurdities." But here Mr. Kaye makes a wrong diagnosis of the disease. Ptolemy was not a Christian, and his school was accepted not only by the Christian Church but by the heathen as far south in Africa as civilization went, as far east as Parthia, Babylonia, and India. Yet in all these places the same sterility held throughout the succeeding centuries, for there was little or no observation of the heavenly bodies. This was due to the fact that astronomy was everywhere subordinated to astrology, and this pseudo-science deals with "signs" and "houses" and the abstract qualities arbitrarily ascribed to them—not with the heavenly bodies themselves.

A. S. D. M.

---

W. A. IVANOW. ISMAILI MSS. IN THE ASIATIC MUSEUM.  
Petrograd, 1917.

In the present paper Professor Ivanow gives us a catalogue raisonné of a collection of Ismaili manuscripts now in the Asiatic Museum at Petrograd, which were collected by Mr. I. Zarubin in 1916.

The collection contains in all eleven numbers, of which seven are separate works, while the remainder contain miscellaneous pamphlets all bearing on the history and doctrines of this famous sect.

The manuscripts were all found in Rawshan or Shugnan on the upper reaches of the Amu Darya, and this circumstance in itself is interesting as showing that the Ismaili sect had admirers, if not adherents, in Central Asia in recent times. Although the capture of Alamut, the chief stronghold of the Ismailis, by the Mongols came very near to destroying the whole sect, Ismailis are still to be found in various parts of Persia, and have, as is well known, survived in Western India to this day under the name of Khojas.<sup>1</sup>

The material brought together by Mr. Zarubin is partly new and partly well known. What is new not only supplements our former knowledge regarding the teachings of this sect, but also furnishes us with many interesting details concerning the intellectual life of Moslem Persia in general. Fresh light, for example, is thrown on the identity in origin of Ismailism and Sufism.

The first book noticed is called *أم الكتاب*.

This work contains an exposition of the fantastic cosmogony representing the views of extreme Shiism, and it does not in any way reveal its connexion with Ismailism; there is, indeed, only one direct reference to Ismailism in the whole course of the manuscript.

The general tenor of the book, however, and the consensus of native opinion leave no room for doubt that this work is an Ismaili production.

It is very difficult to form any opinion of its origin or

<sup>1</sup> There were a sufficient number in Kirmán in Qajár times to cause a serious revolt, which led to the flight of the famous Agha Khán's ancestor to India (1842). See R. G. Watson's *History of Persia* (1866), pp. 191-2, 331-4.

date of composition from internal evidence, either historical, linguistic, or geographical.

The writer, who remains anonymous, does not tell us where he lived, but Professor Ivanow is of opinion that the author was an inhabitant of North-East Afghanistan or the Pamirs, a deduction he arrives at from the intimacy shown with such dialects as Galcha, and the allusions to Tibet.

Various religious matters are discussed in the form of dialogues between the Imam محمد باقر, whom the author calls باقر العلم, and his disciples جابر بن عبد الله انصاری, ابو الخلد كا بلى, etc.

It begins:—

بسم الله وبالله ومن الله هذا مناجات نامہ و یسرّ و یعلن  
حساب الموت و الحیات و المدرجات و صفت نور النبی فقال  
الجابر بن عبد الله نور من المقالات امّ الكتاب سراج امام  
مبین محمد الباقر علیه السلام . . .

The second manuscript bears the title of وجه دین, and contains a succinct account of the inner side of Ismailism. It deals with such matters as prayers, festivals, etc., and discusses certain especially important formulæ.

The author says in his introduction that he has called his book "The Face of the Faith" because, by means of it, men may be able to know things as it were face to face, and because the wise by reading this book may recognize true faith and act upon the knowledge they have gained.



The book contains fifty-one chapters, the titles of which are enumerated in full by Professor Ivanow.

The first few headings will give some idea of the contents of the work.

- (۱) اندر باب اثبات حجّت خدای تعالی
- (۲) پیدا کردن خداوند حق از جمله دعوی کنندگان
- (۳) اندر علم یعنی دانش که چیست
- (۴) اندر عالم روحانی لطیف
- (۵) اندر بهشت و درّاو و کلید درّاو

No date of composition or author is mentioned, but it is generally attributed by Ismailis to Nāṣir-i-Khusraw.

It begins:

حمد و سپاس مر افریده کاریرا که عالم پیدا را از عالم پنهان  
پدید آوریده . . .

The third work is called هفت باب.

This book is also attributed to Nāṣir-i-Khusraw, and contains a short and clear exposition of the Ismaili creed.

The internal evidence goes to disprove entirely that Nāṣir-i-Khusraw could really be its author. For example, Ḥasan-i-Ṣabbāḥ is referred to in two places as "my ancestor", while in another place Fakhr-ud-dīn Rāzi, who lived a century later, is mentioned.

The work is divided into seven chapters, as is implied by its title.

The headings of these chapters are as follows:—

(۱) در بیان احوال این بنده کترین بندکان دعوت هادیّه

مهدیه اسماعیلیه

(۲) در ابطال مذاهب هفتاد و سه (sic) فرقه اهل عالم

(۳) در بیان آنکه درین عالم بجز اینطایفه محقه اسماعیلیان

هیچ فریقه دیگر ناجی نیستند

(۴) در معنی نبوت و وصایت و تأویل و تنزیل فرقان

(۵) در باز نمودن امامت و دور ستر و کشف و معنی

قیامت و قیامات

(۶) در نمودن عالم جسمانی و روحانی و مبدأ و معاد

(۷) در باز نمودن بعضی از تأویلات و فواید متفرقه

This manuscript contains, among other things, several interesting references to little known works, such as

عدة الطالب , روضة التسليم , كنز الغرائب

It begins :

الحمد لله رب العالمين . . . شکر و سپاس و ستادش

مر پروردکاریرا که لمعه اشراق نور تأیید او عقل کلرا

بنور معرفت خود بینا و گویا کرداینده

Numbers 4 and 5 are of mixed contents, and several of the pamphlets they contain are attributed to Nāṣir-i-Khusraw.

Number 6 contains a hitherto unknown Masnavi of 'Aṭṭār, the general tenor of which is ultra-Shiite or Ismaili-Sufistic.

Although this work is apparently unknown, there can be little doubt that it is the work of the great 'Aṭṭār, whose name is mentioned no less than thirty times in the course of the poem, while references are made to his other works, as for example :

سراسر گفته ام در منطق الطیر رموز مارمور و ماهی و طیر

Professor Ivanow quotes a number of interesting passages from this poem which go to show its ultra-

Shiite tendency. The expressions جوهر ذات and

مظهر عجائب occur in several places, but Professor Ivanow was unable to decide whether they referred to compositions of 'Aṭṭār.

Numbers 7, 8, and 9 contain three works which are already known to scholars.

Number 10 is, again, a collection of pamphlets, and number eleven, which is called حکایت قهقهه, describes a fight between 'Alī and a Dīv named Kah-Kaha.

The Persian origin of the larger portion of the works in this collection may be regarded as established, not only by reason of the style, the places named, and the general treatment, but also by the silence preserved on events of importance in the history of Western Ismailism.

These books show the most varied tendencies on the part of the authors, beginning with the strictest and clearest explanation of the beliefs, as in هفت باب, and ending with the fantastical theories of the امّ الکلام.

A special group in this collection consists in works

of a didactic character bordering on Sufism, in which the sect element is emphasised only slightly. Such are, for example, most of the works attributed to Nāṣir-i-Khusraw.

In addition to the purely sectarian books, this collection includes several works on Sufism and Shiism, which are held in honour by the Ismailis, such as the Divan of

Shams-i-Tabrīz, کتاب فارغ, one of the most popular books of the Shiites of Persia, stories of the exploits of 'Alī and the works of Fayzī, the celebrated Indian poet of Akbar's time.

E. DENISON ROSS.

---

HINDUSTANI MANUAL. By Lieut.-Colonel D. C. PHILLOTT.

Third edition. pp. xxvi and 350. Calcutta, published by the Author, 1918.

Colonel Phillott's *Hindustani Manual* is so well known, and so widely used, that all that need be done on the present occasion is to welcome the third edition, and to state wherein it differs from its predecessors.

I am glad to see that the author has abandoned the bad old custom followed by generations of Hindōstānī<sup>1</sup> grammarians of representing *anunāsika* or *nūn ghunna*, by *n* or *ñ*. In the first place, these letters have been established, since the Geneva Oriental Congress of 1894,

<sup>1</sup> I must apologize to Colonel Phillott for so spelling the name of the language. When, in Mughul times, the word came into India, it certainly had the *majhūl* letter, and the change to *n* is a concession to modern Persian, introduced by Gilchrist and obediently followed by his successors. Before his time, every European, writing by ear, spelt the word with an *o*. Nowadays, the letter has lost some of its definite colour owing to the stress-accent on the preceding syllable, and the word is really pronounced "Hindōstānī", in which it is often difficult to distinguish the very short *o* from a very short *u*. In spelling Indian words borrowed from Persian, we must remember that the *istē'māl* ē *Hind* preserves the pronunciation of the mediaeval form of that language. It requires *shēr*, not *shīr*, *gōsht*, not *gūsht*, and *bōsa*, not *būsa*. Sa'dī rhymes *Hindōstān* with *bōstān*. On the subject of the *istē'māl* ē *Hind*, see Blochmann in JASB. xxxvii, 1868, pp. 32 ff., esp. p. 35.

as conventions for representing altogether different sounds; and, in the second place, long experience of unhappy examinees has taught me that a beginner hardly ever pays the slightest attention to the dot over or under the *n*, and almost invariably pronounces, say, *men* or *men* (i.e. *mē*) as if it rhymed with the English "men". In the present edition of his work, Colonel Phillott has accepted the convention employed universally outside Urdū grammars, and uses the tilde, ~, to represent the sound. Here, once the learner has been told that whenever he sees a vowel with this sign over it he is to pronounce it through his nose, there will be no excuse for the mispronunciation.

Four useful appendixes have been added to this edition, dealing respectively with *hamza*; Arabic Forms and Measures; the Gender of Nouns (taken from Platt's Grammar); and the Nāgarī character. In the last, there is a misprint, which might find place in a list of errata, च being transliterated *chchh*, instead of *chch*. The transliterations of the guttural (*ṇa*) and palatal (*ṇa*) nasals fixed by the Geneva Congress have been reversed. In this Colonel Phillott has followed Kellogg, but that writer's grammar was published in 1893, and the Congress system is now universally adopted. The transcription employed in the *Manual* may puzzle learners who proceed to more advanced works or to other languages, such as Sanskrit.

Colonel Phillott is an ardent advocate of the use of the gramophone in teaching languages, and in this I am heart and soul with him. To my knowledge, it is employed most successfully in London at the present day for French, Italian, Spanish, and German, and it could be easily adapted for the Hindōstānī in his book. It would be a great thing if a selection from his vocabularies and sentences could be recorded in such a machine by some good speaker, and the results sold with them. It would

give a finishing touch to his admirable labours. A gramophone is in some respects better than any. Munshī, for it will repeat, without any grumbling, a word or a sentence a hundred times if required, and always in exactly the same tone.

Another minor improvement that I would suggest is the addition of a good table of contents showing, in order, the main subjects of each lesson. There is a good index, but this does not always supply its place. I think that both are wanted.

Colonel Phillott will not, I am sure, object to these councils of perfection, even if they partake of the nature of gilding refined gold, and we, on our part, can heartily congratulate him on the success his book has deservedly achieved.

GEORGE A. GRIERSON.

---

COLLOQUIAL ENGLISH - PERSIAN DICTIONARY IN THE ROMAN CHARACTER. Containing all English words in common use with their meanings in modern Persian, with numerous examples. By Lieut.-Colonel D. C. PHILLOTT, Ph.D., F.A.S.B., late Secretary and Member, Board of Examiners, Calcutta, etc. Calcutta: printed at the Baptist Mission Press and published by the Author. 1914.

In his "Colloquial English-Persian Dictionary" Lieut.-Colonel Phillott has made a gift of great value to foreign residents in Persia and to all students of the modern speech of Iran. The author has already revealed his quality as a Persian and Arabic scholar, and in the present work he further gives evidence of an extended and practical acquaintance with the literary and colloquial idiom of present-day Persia, while in the foot-notes and asides with which he enlivens every page, he presents us with much curious information regarding matters philological and anthropological.

Colonel Phillott may rest assured that the results of his very considerable labours will receive a warm and enduring welcome. Palmer's little English - Persian Dictionary I many years ago drove from my shelves into outer darkness; Wollaston, in his more ponderous form, has dwelt for years in the bottom of a jettisoned book-box, and in his lighter has enjoyed the obscure if honourable retirement of a remote shelf; but "Phillott" since his advent has lived on my writing table or within arm's length. I know no greater compliment I can pay the author than this, and I would have the fact kept firmly in mind when I pass to criticism.

The volume contains 361 pages with double columns, is of a convenient format, (about) 14 by 7½ inches, and typographically is all that could be desired. The margins are sufficient to permit the addition of manuscript notes. Unfortunately the binding is quite unequal to the requirements of a permanent work of reference, and under stress of use the book early begins to resolve itself into its component pages.

The work appears to me to suffer in some degree from the desire of its author to withhold from his readers no interesting fact of which he is in possession. This would account for the presence of such verbal curios as "galangal" and "metheglin" (which are unknown to the Concise Oxford Dictionary), with "tabasheer", "myrobalan", and "inspissate", as well as for the inclusion of a highly eclectic assembly of proper names, e.g. Somnath, Sodom, Socotra, Nazareth, Khaibar. This, however, is a matter of small consequence; what is important to one who wants to have the colloquial resources of English and Persian equated and at his command is the use of the principal prepositions and conjunctions, which are the most determining element and a very elusive one in the idiom of analytical languages.

To the most important prepositions Colonel Phillott assigns space as follows: "at," half a line; "from," half a line; "in," three lines; "of," *nīl*; "to," half a line; "with," two lines. Conjunctions and the like fare no better: "as" is dismissed in six lines (with reference to "far" for "as far as"); "as if," "as though," "however," are not to be found at all. The "articles" "a" and "the" do not appear among the elect, and the student is left to guess how the conceptions implied by them are presented by Persian.

These are specimens chosen at random, but they reveal what is to my mind a grave weakness of the book. Personally I would gladly have remained in ignorance of "metheglin", and forfeited a part of the forty-six lines devoted to "kite", "hawk", and "falcon" if I could have had in their stead an illuminating article by Colonel Phillott on some of the particles.

Passing to a consideration of the Persian contents of the Dictionary, Colonel Phillott has given the word "colloquial" a wide interpretation, and he will defend himself by contending that there is no form of speech so "high", literary or recondite, that educated Persians will not make use of it on occasion, for they take a pride in the manifold resources of their language and a full command of them is the attribute of a gentleman, while in letter-writing it is the fashion to use a large and specialized vocabulary. It would, therefore, be unsafe to assert that sentences like *Vahm dar umūr-i bashariyya fi'āl ast* (s.v. "effect") are not colloquial Persian. More open to objection are certain words, freely given in this Dictionary, which, as far as my experience goes, are practically obsolete in ordinary speech. Such are: *pārsā* (s.v. pious and abhorrence); *khavār* (abject); *āmīkhtan* (mix); *andukhtan* (accumulate); *bar-afrahkhtan* (elevate); *bīm* (fear); *afrahkhtan* (kindle); *sukhan guftan* (say, speak), etc. I should not necessarily exclude these words



from a colloquial dictionary, but I should mark them or place them so that it would be clear that they are not in general daily use.

On the other hand, a certain number of "local" words are given. In the present state of Persian lexicography there is much to be said for recording words for which there is only local warrant. Many may prove to be of more general extension than was at first suspected. This, however, does not apply to words used in Baghdad, Basrah, Kuwait, and Bahrain. There is no advantage in importing into a Persian dictionary these or other Arabic words which have happily *not* been incorporated into the Persian language. For examples, see s.vv. "lure", "glove". Similarly, Indian and Afghan Persian might well be reserved for a separate work. The fact that the Persian *gaz* (tamarisk-tree) is also called *farrāsh* in the Panjab will leave even many an Anglo-Indian cold. Isolated specimens of such exotics in a book devoted to *Persian* Persian appear out of place and useless.

Proverbial phrases and metaphorical expressions—though one may sometimes suspect their universal currency—are valuable as illustrating the free way in which Persians handle their own language, and are often in themselves picturesque and amusing. *Mihmān i bī dandān dar rāh ast*, "a 'little stranger' is expected," puts the coming baby on the footing of an honoured guest whose diet may require consideration, and overlooks its less pleasing attributes; *hāshiya-nishīn*, "flatterer," conjures up a picture of one who sits on the edge of the carpet, insinuating himself into the society of his superiors and striving to ingratiate himself by an excess of humility; *man mūdānam ki kujā khirs tukhm mīguzārad*, "I can see further through a stone wall than most men" (I know where the bear lays his eggs), is another example of the humorous absurd.

The fact that many recognized principles of scientific

arrangement are systematically violated by Colonel Phillott is a serious blemish in his work. I will give only a few specimens of such infractions. They could be multiplied indefinitely :—

“Old.” The essential words are *kuhna*, *pīr*, and *qadīm*, but these are preceded by five other words, three of which may be called uncommon in colloquial.

“Bread, *khūbz*, *nān* . . .” *Nān* is the universal word; the Arabic *khūbz* is a pure piece of pedantry in the mouth of a Persian.

“Send.” Here we have “*ṭalabīdan* (‘summon’) *fristādan* . . . ; *hāẓir k.* . . . ; *irsāl dāshtan*; *infāz k.* . . . ; *mab’ūṣ k.* (‘of apostles only’); *iḥzār k.* (‘to make present’)”. There should be two headings, “Send” and “Send for”.

Words should not be repeated under allied but inappropriate heads. Thus: *āhār*, “paste,” should not be given under “glue” as well as under “paste”; and “*shulla* (properly gruel for eating)” —granting the accuracy of the parenthesis—should not be given under “paste”, but under “gruel”, where, however, it does not appear.

“Spread.” Here we find eight Persian verbs given, of which 1, 3, and 4 are transitive; 2, 5, 6, 7 are intransitive (of news, etc.); 8 intransitive (of disease). A better order would probably be 3, 1, 4; 6, 2, 5; 7; 8.

“Ground, *zamīn*; *khāk* (‘earth’); *zamīna* (‘of picture, background’); *jahāz dar rīg nishast* (‘the ship grounded’) . . .” The English verb and noun should be separated.

“Kind, *jins* . . . (followed by a number of words meaning ‘species’); *jinsī* (adj. ‘in kind’, opposed to *naqdī*); *mihrbān*, adj. (‘kind’) . . .”

“Egg-plant, *bādinjān*; *bādinjān i farangī* (‘tomato’).” The second entry is irrelevant. “Tomato” is dealt with in its proper place.

This red-herring type of digression is even more marked in such an entry as—

"Kick, *lagad* z. ('with one leg'; also 'to stoop', of falcon) . . . v. 'slovenly'."

"Slovenly, *shalakhta* (adj. 'slovenly', gen. of men; also a 'kick' on the backside) . . . ."

The author might have spared a page to state the phonetic value of the symbols he employs, and call attention, for instance, to the various values of *ā*, of which the rarest is the *a* of the English "father".

The writing of *y* as a glide before or after a palatal vowel is a concession to the *ي* of the script. The glide is slight and better ignored than over-emphasized. So read under "quittance" *navishta i barāt*—rather than *navishta-yi barā'at*—; *barā.i* rather than *barā-yi* ("for"); *mālī.āt*, not *mālīyyāt* (at best the double *y* is a concession to Arabic); *rū i*, not *rū-yi*; *nī.āmad*, *nē.āmad*, not *na-yāmad*. Where there is no palatal vowel the *ي* of the script may justly be rendered by *y*. Thus *bāyad*, etc.

Apart from the scheme of sounds there are many small matters of form and vocabulary which are characteristic of the colloquial speech, where the author's attention seems to have been directed rather to the written than to the spoken language. I can cite only a few instances:—

*Tanāf* is the ordinary pronunciation of *tanāb* ("rope"); *kāchīk* is the more usual pronunciation of the written *kūchak* ("small"); *āwurd* is more common than *āvarđ*; and *bē.ārīd* is at least as frequent as *bē.āvarīd*.

Ordinary speech favours *-ānd-* as against *-ānīd-* in the causative base of transitive verbs:—

*dawānd-*      *chaspānd-*      *khwabānd-*

*tarsānd-*      *rasānd-*      *guzrānd-* (the *ā* = *ū* or *ö*).

The Dictionary vacillates in the matter; it has *rasānīd-* and *rasānd-* and *guzrānd-*, but otherwise *-ānīd-*.

In common speech *a* is constantly used for *ast*; a few instances only are recorded in the Dictionary. The dative with *rā* has largely given place to *bī*, plus pronoun or noun. Thus: "I said to you," *bēt guftam* (neither *bī.at*

nor *turā*, as s.v. "thee"). *Bēt* would, of course, only be used familiarly or to an inferior, otherwise *bi shumā*, *bi janāb 'ālī*, or the like.

No small credit and much gratitude are due to Colonel Phillott for the pains he must have expended in correcting his proofs. There are, it is true, not a few misprints in the English, but they will neither perplex nor mislead the simplest-minded. The Persian, which is what really matters, is remarkably free from error. I may note the following slips which caught my eye:—

s.v. "Fir"	for <i>kaj</i>	read <i>kāj</i>
"Irrigation"	„ <i>āb-pashī</i>	„ <i>āb-pāshī</i>
"Iṣfahān"	„ <i>shāgrīd</i>	„ <i>shāgīrd</i>
"Letter"	„ <i>ḥākm</i>	„ <i>ḥukm</i>
"Print"	„ <i>pa</i>	„ <i>pā</i>
"Yard"	„ <i>zirā'</i>	„ <i>zīrā'</i>
"God"	„ <i>bi'llāh va-'llāh</i>	„ <i>va-'llāh bi'llāh</i>
"Please"	„ <i>inshā' Allāh fardā</i>	„ <i>fardā inshā'</i> <i>Allāh</i>

"Empty" what is *ughur*? Is it for *ākhūr*?

At all times a Dictionary excites to thought and dispute, but where the author has, as in this case, decanted generously of his miscellaneous information, and has had the strength of mind, in order to save space, to limit the explanation or qualification necessary to self-defence, no page can fail to furnish matter for comment, query, challenge or desire for enlightenment. The author, who has provided so much mental stimulus, must not complain at the suggestions he provokes, but look on them rather as a testimony to the regard in which he is held. On this understanding I will venture a few remarks in the most humble spirit on random points which have arrested my attention. To save space all statements are made in dogmatic form.

*arbāb* is given as "landholder (big)", but not in its common use as "master" of a servant.

The *izāfa* is almost invariably expressed after nouns and adjectives used as prepositions when followed by a noun. Its frequent omission in the Dictionary is misleading. Cf. "at", "front", "behind", "beside", "in", "on", etc., and read *dam i*, *pīsh i*, *pusht i*, *pahlū i*, *dākhil i* (*darūn* is obsolete colloquially), *bālā i*, *rū i*, etc., etc.

*bukhav* is not given under "fetter" but under "manacle", though it is stated (in my opinion wrongly) that it is "only for feet". "Manacle," from Latin *manicula*, is properly a "fetter for the hand". I would suggest that in this and other similar cases all the information should be grouped under one head (here "fetter"), and that only a cross-reference should be given under the other (here "manacle").

"prison," *zanjīr* and *zanjīr k.*, are very common in this sense. I have never heard *dustāq-khāna* nor I think *qayd-khāna* in Persia. I do not know "to prison" as an English verb outside the poets. In any case the verbal equivalents have already been given under "imprison".

"little," *andak*, is almost obsolete in colloquial.

"hue and cry," *dād u bīdād*, contains no idea of pursuit; it is only an outcry against injustice frequently imaginary, a futile kind of noisy complaining, peculiarly Persian and peculiarly annoying.

*mahz i* is given in the sense of "as soon as" s.v. "soon", but not in the common sense of "for the sake of", except in (*mahz i*) *pās i khātīr i shumā* s.v. "for". I must confess, by the way, to ignorance of this *pās* given again under "sake of".

"wealthy," *tavāngar*, the first word given, is obsolete colloquially.

"thin," *subuk*—*sangīn*, of tea, cf. s.v. "weak". *Kamrang* and *purrang* are the ordinary terms for "weak" and "strong" of tea. *Sangīn* is frequently used of water which is found to be bad for the digestion, doubtless because of mineral ingredients.

"obtain," *yāftan*, obsolete colloquially.

"understand," *dar-yāftan*, not in colloquial use.  
*Daryāft n.* = "to obtain, extract, take over something from someone".

"procure," strike out *yāftan* and substitute *paidā k.*, *farāham āwurdan*, *justan* ("by search," etc.).

p. 122, n. 2, "*sarḥadd* in m.c. also = *qashlāq*," a slip for *yēlāq*.

s.vv. "kingdom", "animal", *hay(a)vānā(t)*. I have heard only *hayvān*, i.e. *haivān*, without the medial *α*.

p. 175, n. 2. This change of *α* to *i* is particularly characteristic of the Kermani dialect. The resulting *i* there, I have been told, goes under the name of the *Fath' i Yezdī*.

"yard." Colonel Phillott gives, "*gaz* and *vār* (the Persian ell of about 40 inches); *zirā'* . . . (from the elbow to the tip of the middle finger, i.e. about 20 inches) . . . vulgarly *zur'*, is used for *gaz*."

I should state the facts as follows; *zar'* (or *zar'*?), the universal standard of linear measure, about 40 inches; *vār*, about equivalent to English "yard", of cloth; *gaz*, ditto, but not generally known in Upper Persia.

*Gaz* is used in the Gabri dialect in the sense of a "yard", and in Bakhtiari in that of the "cleaning rod" of a rifle, as well as "yard".

*Zirā'* (not *zirā'*). I do not know this in ordinary use, but the Arabs of Arabistan use the term as a "cubit" in water soundings, etc., pronouncing it *ḏhrā'* or *drā'*.

"embark," *savār-shudan-i dar kishtī*. Is this an abstract noun "embarking", and what is the *izāfa*, *-i*?

"change to," intrs. *farq k.* *Hawā farq na kardā*, "the weather hasn't changed"; to change into . . . *shudan (bi)* . . .; trs. to change (clothes), *'ivaz k.* (pron. *awaz*); *ālisht k.* is used in various dialects.

p. 135, n. 6. "*khar*, Old Persian 'big'". False etymology. *Khargūsh* is "the donkey-eared one", "donkey-ear";

Avestic *khara*-="donkey". *kharchang* is given by both Horn and Hübschmann as altered from Pahlavi *karchang* by popular etymology identifying the *kar*- with *khar*-, "donkey."

"Tabriz," frequently called *Taurīz*, even by educated Persians.

"thing." I do not know the singular *shay* in colloquial Persian. *chi chīz* (vulg. *chī*) = "what?" *chi chī mīkhvāhī*? "what do you want?" *ismat chi chī?* "what is your name?"

"negro." The ordinary term, in my experience, is the combination *kākā-sī.āh*.

"pass." For *tang-rāh* read *tang*, and for *gudāra* read *gudār*.

"guide." The general word for a guide (man) in colloquial Persian is *balad*.

I will now give some of a number of words of very common occurrence in colloquial Persian which have occurred to my mind at haphazard, and which I have endeavoured to trace in the Dictionary:

*dilkhur*, fifth word given under "annoyed".

*diltang*, "vexed, annoyed," weaker than last; I have only found it under "lonely", not, in my opinion, a fair meaning.

*nāqulā*, a difficult word: "villainous, obstreperous, vile, rough, etc., devil of a . . . , nasty-looking" (of man, mountain, club, etc.) I have failed to find.

*mī.ānīshān bad ast*, "they are on bad terms, there are unfriendly relations between them."

*rāh ba ānhā dārad*, "he has means of approaching them, he has diplomatic relations with them."

*bastagī*; *bastagān*, "relations of alliance or dependence between an inferior and a superior; supporters, dependants, followers." Not found.

*nā-amn*, *nā-munazzam*, "insecure, unsafe, disturbed" (of country, road, etc.).

*nā amnī.at*, "insecurity, state of disturbance."

*amn*, as adj. (?), "secure, safe, *rāh amn ast*. Given under "safety".

*munazzam*, "secure, safe, in good order." Given under "order".

*shulākh* (ordinary pron.), "disturbance, row"; as adj. "disturbed, in confusion". Given under "disturbance" and "noise" as *shuluq*, and elsewhere as *shulūq*.

*rū-sī.āh*, "discredited, disgraced."

*kārsāzi k.*, "to make preliminary arrangements for a journey." Given under "pay" and elsewhere in its meaning of arrange for the payment of a debt.

*yawāsh yawāsh*, "slowly" (of movement); "quietly, in a low voice" (of speaking). Given under "gently" and "slowly", but not in its very common reduplicated form.

*naẓmī.a*, "police"; *ilāra i naẓmī.a*, "police department"; *ajzā i naẓmī.a*, "police staff"; *raīs i naẓmī.a*, "Chief of Police." Not given.

*bī.urza*, "a term of contempt for a person; worthless(?), incompetent(?)." Not found.

*wahshat paidā k.*, "to be scared, frightened." Not found.

*sūzāndan*, *sūzān-*, "to burn" (trs.); *pidarash mīsūzanam*, a universal denunciation, "I'll burn his father."

*taklīf*, "duty, proper course of action"; *taklīf i banda chīst?*, "what ought I to do?" Given under "do", also "majority" and "puberty" (*ḥadl i taklīf*).

*ājiz*, "wearied, worn-out (by importunities), desperate." Given under "tired".

*rasīdugī*, "investigation, hearing (of a case)."

*purs k.*, "to ask, inquire."

*tīr khawrdan*, "to be wounded (by a missile)."

*tīr andākhītan*, "to fire, shoot."

*chi 'aib dārad?*, *chirā*, "why not?" *chirā* is given under "certainly" and "(of) course".



*tal*, "an isolated hill" (bigger than a *tappa*, I think). Given under "heap", "mound".

The results of my investigations in this direction, however, go to show that almost all the words and expressions in daily use have been recorded by Colonel Phillott, and with patience can be found.

In conclusion, I would revert to my original statement that this Dictionary is a most valuable work. We may regret the inclusion of some words that are obsolete, especially when they are given precedence over others in daily use; we may cavil at the arrangement of the contents of individual paragraphs, and at the system which permits of "kind" (species) and "kind" (benevolent) being treated as if they presented contiguous ideas, and at transitions from egg-plants to tomatoes, we may challenge the applicability of the epithet "colloquial" to many of the phrases given, but none the less we will readily admit that the Persian in general is good, and that we are put in possession of a great store of correct information regarding word-usage and customs.

All we would ask is that Colonel Phillott should keep his second edition in mind, and be prepared to increase our obligations to him by a few additions and a few alterations of arrangement.

He might devote a page or two to explaining his transliteration, and give an outline of the chief sounds of Colloquial Persian expressed in terms of the International Phonetic Association's symbols. He might give a list of his principal sources, and differentiate between what he has derived from word of mouth and what from written documents. Who, by the way, is "Professor S. T."? (and is "Prof. S. J.", p. 4, an alias or a rival?). Is he the "St. Clair-Tisdall" of the *Modern Persian Conversation-Grammar*?

Lastly, will Colonel Phillott enhance the value of his book by adding an index to his foot-notes and to the

asides in the text, and will he consider the possibility of a complete index of all Persian words? This would be a convenient addition, and would almost give the book the value of a modern Persian-English Dictionary.

We will not stay for an answer, but content ourselves with reiterating our thanks for favours received.

D. L. R. LORIMER.

---

In the Cairene *Kurūkab* of June 24, Mr. Aḥmad Shākir al-Karami announces the discovery by Sayyid Muḥibb al-dīn the Khaṭīb of the first part of the *Fuṣūl wa-Ghāyāt* of Abu'l-'Alā Ma'arri, the Arabic poet whom von Kremer made famous. This work was supposed to be an endeavour to rival the Qur'an, and in consequence had little chance of surviving; Yaqut in his Biographical Dictionary narrates a case wherein a pious librarian destroyed a copy. Some fragments were collected by the present writer in his Dissertation on the Lists of Abu'l-'Alā's works contributed to the Amari Memorial Volumes. The edition of the part discovered will be received with great interest when it appears.

D. S. M.

---



# NOTES OF THE QUARTER

(April-June, 1919)

---

## GENERAL MEETINGS OF THE ROYAL ASIATIC SOCIETY

*April 8, 1919.* — Mr. M. Longworth Dames, Vice-President, in the Chair.

The following were elected members of the Society :—

Moulvi Muhammad Akhtar Adil, M.A.

Professor Chandas.

Professor John Garstang, D.Sc. (Oxon).

Miss Alice Getty.

Mr. E. J. Holmyard, B.A.

A paper was read by Dr. Stephen Langdon on "Gesture in Prayer in the Religion of Babylonia and Adjacent Lands", followed by a discussion in which Sir Henry Howorth, Dr. Theophilus Pinches, Mr. Hirschfeld, Dr. Gaster, Professor Hagopian, and the Chairman took part. Dr. Langdon having replied, the meeting resolved itself into a Special General Meeting, at which the Rev. A. H. Sayce, Professor of Assyriology in Oxford University, was unanimously elected an Honorary Vice-President of the Royal Asiatic Society.

---

## ANNIVERSARY MEETING

The Anniversary Meeting was held on May 13, 1919, with Lord Reay, President, in the Chair.

The following were elected members of the Society :—

Mr. Kali Kumar Chattopadhyaya, B.A.

Mr. Kamalaprasad Dutt, M.A., B.L.

Mr. K. C. Mehra, L.S.E.

Mr. K. D. Mudalier.

Dr. Ishwari Prasad, M.A.

Mr. K. R. Venkatavaman, B.A.

Dr. Andrew Ellis Wynter.

The Secretary then read the Report of the Council for 1918-19 as follows :—

## ANNUAL REPORT, 1918-19

In spite of the disturbed conditions fifty-five ordinary members have been elected to the Society during the year.

Moulvi M. Aktar Adil, M.A.	Don Baron Jayatilaka, B.A.
Mr. Fakhruddin Ahmad, M.A.	Mr. Ram Chandra Kak.
Mr. K. A. Ahmad Ansary, B.A.	Babu Chhail Bihari Lal,
Mr. Saya Maung Ba.	M.A., LL.B.
Lieut. C. C. Baker.	Mr. Lala Mohan Lal, M.A.
Mr. Jyoti Prasad Banerjea,	Stanley C. E. Legg, M.A.
B.A., B.L.	Mr. Marino M. Lusy.
Mr. Ullah Baraket, M.A.	Mr. William Montgomery
Mr. V. G. Bhāt, B.A.	McGovern.
Saddharmavagish, Rev. Sri	Captain D. R. MacIvor, M.A.
Aryalavkar Bhikshu.	Mr. Madan Gopal Mehta.
Professor Chandos.	Babu Satis Chandra Mitra, B.A.
Professor Ram Chandra.	Prof. Henry W. B. Moreno, M.A.
Mr. Akamuna Chizen.	Dr. Tellicherry Madhavan Nair.
Dr. Walter E. Clark.	Miss F. E. Newton, F.R.G.S.
Babu Mahin Chandra Das, B.A.	Mr. Warner M. van Norden.
Mr. Yahanna Dawud.	Mr. S. Chandra Patranavis.
Mr. P. M. Debbarmān, B.Sc.	Mr. Saya M. Tun Pé, M.A.
Signor G. Furlani, Ph.D., LL.D.	Mr. Edward W. Perera.
Prof. T. S. Ganesier, M.A., L.T.	Babu Mrityunjoy Rath.
Mr. John Garstang, D.Sc.	Mr. W. Harry Rylands, F.S.A.
Miss Alice Getty.	Babu J. Saba, B.A., B.L.
Professor V. S. Ghate.	Mr. Ikbal Ali Shah.
Mr. Sudhi Chandra Ghosh.	Mr. R. C. Campbell Thompson,
Mr. Lionel Giles, M.A., Litt.D.	M.A., F.S.A.
Mr. K. Lal Gurū.	Mr. Raghukul Tilak, F.R.E.S.
Mr. Kripa Shankar Hajela,	Mr. Ramji Das Vaishya,
M.Sc., LL.B.	F.R.S.A.
Mr. Herbert E. E. Hayes.	Mr. H. T. Wickham.
Mr. J. Drummond Hogg.	Mr. Chauncey Winckworth.
Mr. E. J. Holmyard, B.A.	Capt. C. Leonard Wcolley, V.C

In addition to the above the following eight life members have come over from the Society of Biblical Archæology :—

Major W. J. Freer, F.S.A.	Mr. A. W. Oke.
Mr. R. E. Graves.	Lord Peckover of Wisbech,
Mr. C. P. Keith.	LL.D.
Mr. J. Mulling.	Rev. Dr. Powell.
Professor J. L. Myres.	Mr. J. T. Tremlett, M.A.

The following fifty-four ordinary members of the Society of Biblical Archæology have joined the Royal Asiatic Society :—

Miss F. S. Adam.	Miss C. M. Longdon.
Baroness Amherst of Hackney.	Mr. S. E. Loxton.
Mr. W. E. Baxter, LL.D.	Rev. Canon E. McClure.
Mr. George Bell.	Rev. W. MacGregor, M.A.
Mr. R. H. Blanchard.	Mr. R. Mond.
Mr. G. Brownen, F.C.S.	Rev. J. B. Nies, Ph.D.
Mr. J. E. Bruce.	Rev. F. C. Norton, M.A.
Mr. W. Moir Bryce.	Mr. J. Offord.
Dr. E. A. W. Budge.	Mr. David Paton.
Professor F. C. Burkitt.	Mr. E. S. M. Perowne, F.R.S.
Dr. Colin Campbell.	Mr. E. J. Pilcher.
Mr. Richard Cooke.	Rev. W. T. Pilter, M.A.
Mr. W. E. Crum, M.A.	The Hon. Emmeline M.
Rev. E. Donaldson.	Plunkett.
Miss M. F. Ellis.	Mr. F. W. Read.
Dean of Ely (Dr. Kirkpatrick).	Mr. C. B. Rickett.
Ella Lady Eve.	Mr. F. Rockstro.
Mr. A. H. Gardiner, Ph.D.	Mr. Mortimer Rooke.
Mr. F. W. Green.	Mr. W. J. S. Sallaway.
Mr. F. Ll. Griffith, M.A., F.S.A.	Mr. A. B. Sayce, M.A.
Dr. Rendel Harris.	Dr. C. Knox-Shaw.
Mr. Edgar E. Harrison.	Mr. Ernest Sibree, M.A.
Mr. Ernest Hartland, F.S.A.	Mr. J. Stanton.
Mr. Charles Heape.	Sir Herbert Thompson, Bart.
Miss J. C. Herbert.	Miss E. Trotter.
Rev. J. P. Hodgkinson, D.D.	Rev. B. A. Warburton.
Mr. E. W. Hollingworth.	Mr. G. de L. Wills.
Sir H. H. Howorth, K.C.I.E.	Mr. J. T. Wills.
Mr. D. van Hoytema.	Mr. W. F. Winckworth.
Mr. H. Sefton Jones.	

Against these accessions we regret to have to place the names of the following Honorary and Ordinary Members who have died during the year. The loss of two Honorary Members, of a former Vice-President and Secretary, and of our late Hon. Treasurer in one year makes this list a specially mournful one.

Professor Julius Eggeling (Hon.).	Mr. William Hoey, M.A., D.Litt.
Dr. Ernst Windisch (Hon.).	Colonel G. A. Jacob, Hon. Litt.D. (Cantab.).
H.E. Yacoub Artin Pasha.	Rev. Fredk. MacCormick, F.S.A. (Scot.), F.R.S.A.I.
Mr. James Dyer Ball, I.S.O.	Rev. Laurence Heyworth Mills, M.A., D.D.
Dr. Paul Carus.	Mr. Robert Roy.
Mr. Wilson Crewdson, J.P., F.S.A.	Mr. G. C. Whitworth. C.I.E.

A full account of the career and literary work of Professor Eggeling will be found in the January number of this Journal. Though a German by birth he spent the larger part of his life in this country, and his connexion with our Society began when he became its Secretary in 1869. It was a grief to him that the outbreak of war found him in Westphalia, and his efforts to obtain leave to return to this country proved fruitless. His work for our Society included the publication of a catalogue of the Buddhist Sanskrit MSS. possessed by the Society, compiled in collaboration with Professor Cowell in 1875. Professor A. A. Macdonell's obituary notice chronicles the more important of his general publications.

The news of Dr. Ernst Windisch's death, which occurred in October of last year at his home in Leipzig, reached this country too late for any obituary notice to appear in the January Journal, but an account of his work will appear in the number for April. Dr. Windisch laboured in two different but connected spheres of learning; he was

eminent as a Sanskrit scholar, while his publication of a series of Middle Irish texts, at a time when such texts were not easily accessible, caused him to be looked upon as a guide and teacher by students of the older forms of the Celtic tongue. His glossary of Middle Irish (1880) has never been superseded and is the indispensable companion of all interested in such studies. Dr. Windisch had a particular admiration for the cultured English man of letters and for the system of voluntary and free research pursued in this country, as opposed to the State-directed and State-aided methods more common in Germany. He delighted to visit his English friends, and his kindly nature made him welcome and beloved by scholars in this country.

The death of the Rev. L. H. Mills, D.D., Professor of Zend Philology at Oxford, removes an Orientalist, much of whose work has appeared at various times in the Journal of the R.A.S. A list of these contributions will be found attached to the Bishop of Salford's obituary notice in the January number of the Journal. His last contribution was published in the same number and was left only partially corrected when death overtook him. He had been a member of the Society since 1897.

Dr. Augustus Frederick Rudolf Hoernle, C.I.E., joined the R.A.S. soon after his retirement from the Indian Educational Service in 1899. He served both as member of Council and as Vice-President, and he contributed many important articles to our Journal. An obituary notice by Sir George Grierson, with a full list of his publications, appeared in the January Journal.

In June of last year the Society lost, through death, the valued services of Mr. Wilson Crewdson, J.P., F.S.A., Order of the Rising Sun, who had acted for a year as Hon. Treasurer to the Society. He had proved an admirable colleague, whose courtesy and consideration for others never failed; his interest in the welfare of the



Society was great, and his intimate acquaintance with commercial matters would have been, had he been spared, of great service to our affairs. He knew much of Japan and the Japanese, and he had a special interest in Japanese prints.

On his death Mr. Kennedy, the former Hon. Treasurer, was called upon again to take up his old duties. He resigned his place as Vice-President in favour of Sir Charles J. Lyall in order to return to the more onerous task of conducting the financial affairs of the Society with the assistance of Mrs. Frazer, who kindly undertook to act as assistant Hon. Treasurer.

A no less serious loss in the ranks of those "on active service" for the benefit of the Society was the retirement of Dr. O. Codrington, F.S.A., who for twenty-eight years had filled the post of Hon. Librarian to the Society, and who, among other services rendered alike to officers and members of the Society, had compiled a valuable catalogue of the Arabic, Persian, and Turkish MSS. in the Society's Library. His familiar figure will be missed from the rooms, and his sound advice and ready help will long be gratefully remembered by the Council and officers of the R.A.S. He has been succeeded in the post of Hon. Librarian by Mr. Alexander G. Ellis, Assistant Librarian to the India Office.

In October, 1918, another change took place through the resignation of Mr. R. W. Frazer, LL.B., I.C.S. (ret.) from the Secretaryship. The present Secretary, Miss Eleanor Hull, was appointed to succeed him in December of the same year.

The vacancies left in the list of our Honorary Members have been filled by the election of M. A. Foucher to succeed the late M. Chavaunes, and of the Right Rev. Louis Charles Casartelli, Bishop of Salford, Professor of Zend and Pehlevi at Louvain University from 1900 to 1903, and lecturer in Iranian languages at the University

of Manchester, to succeed to the vacancy left by the death of Dr. Julius Eggeling.

The Rev. A. H. Sayce, Professor of Assyriology in Oxford, has been elected an Honorary Vice-President of the Society, in recognition of his services to Oriental studies, especially in the Near East.

The following fifteen members have resigned :—

Mr. Herbert Baynes.	Major David Lawlor
Captain T. P. Devlin, R.A.M.C.	McCarrison.
Mr. R. W. Frazer, LL.B.,	Colonel Sir A. Henry McMahon,
I.C.S. (ret.).	G.C.V.O., K.C.I.E., C.S.I.
Miss A. L. B. Hardcastle.	Rev. N. Jatila Mohathera.
Mr. Hirachand L. Jhaveri.	Mr. E. A. Seaton, M.A.
Pandit Lachhmidar Kalla, M.A.	Arjan Singh, Sirdar.
Pandit Ram Sarupa Kaushala.	Mr. Venketash V. Savani, M.A.
Mr. Surendra Nath Kumar.	Mrs. John C. Wrenshall.

Under Rule 25 (a) the following twenty-seven cease to be members of the Society :—

Maulavi B. Ahmad.	Mr. S. Tribubhan Deb.
Mr. H. R. Batheja, M.A.	Mr. Mahbubul Huq, M.A.
Mr. Jagan Nath Bhandari,	Mr. Kashi Prasad Jayaswal.
M.A., LL.B.	Moulvi M. Z. Ullah Khan.
Mr. Ram Rakha M. Bhandari.	Babu R. Krishna, Zamindar.
Mr. Brindaban Chandra Bhatta-	Professor Alastair S. Mackenzie,
charya, B.A.	M.A., LL.D.
Pandit Venkanna Bhatta.	Dr. Binoy Lal Majumdar.
Rev. John Bowen.	Mr. Moti Lal Manucha.
Mr. Anilanganath Banerjee,	Mr. Quzi Muhammad
M.B.	Mehr-ud-din.
Mr. Aboni Chandra Chatterjea.	Mr. Kolatheri S. Menon, M.A.
Babu Devakumar Roy Chand-	Mr. Sarat Chandra Mitra, M.A.
huri, Zamindar.	Professor W. J. Prendergast,
Mr. Mohammed Narul Huq	B.Litt. (Oxon).
Chaudhury, B.A.	M. Pandit Banke Rai.
Mr. M. Roy Chowdhury, Rai	M. R. Ry. Rao Sahib G. V.
Bahadur, Zamindar.	Ramamurti,
Prof. C. Everett Conant, Ph.D.	

The special lists have not undergone any change this year.

The total number of members now stands at 759.

The most important change that has taken place since the last Anniversary Meeting has been the incorporation of the Society of Biblical Archæology with the Royal Asiatic Society. The two Societies were engaged in very similar investigations; to some extent they covered the same ground. Thus there was some waste of energy with occasional overlapping. The question of amalgamation had been mooted on more than one occasion many years ago; and in December, 1917, informal *pourparlers* with this object were begun between individual members of the two Societies. Ultimately a joint committee was appointed to consider whether amalgamation was desirable and, if so, on what terms it could be arranged. The scheme which was drawn up was laid before the Councils of the two Societies, and after full discussion was referred to the Societies' Solicitors and incorporated in a formal agreement, which was laid before the members at a special general meeting held in October last. This agreement, as confirmed at this general meeting, provided for the transfer of the property of the Society of Biblical Archæology to the Royal Asiatic Society, and the admission of members of the former Society to be members of the latter upon favourable terms. The union, although not yet formally completed,<sup>1</sup> is an accomplished fact.

Fifty-seven members of the Society of Biblical Archæology have joined the Royal Asiatic Society; the library has been transferred to Albemarle Street, after disposing of what was deemed superfluous; the invested funds of the Society of Biblical Archæology now stand in the name of the Royal Asiatic Society, and five former

<sup>1</sup> The business of winding up the affairs of the SBA. has since been completed.

members of the Council of the extinct Society are now members of our Council, or have been proposed for election. Professor Sayce, an honoured name, is elected an Honorary Vice-President of our Society for life, and the memory of the Society of Biblical Archæology is kept alive by a notice on our Journal's title-page. Thus a somewhat arduous and complicated business has been brought to a successful conclusion, and the thanks of our Society are due to those who took part in it, more especially to the Honorary Solicitors, Mr. A. H. Wilson and Mr. Perowne, who acted throughout to the great advantage of the Societies.

The following papers have been read before the Society during the course of the year :—

*June 11, 1918.* "The Bhāgavata Purāna and the Sects dependent thereon." By J. N. Farquhar, D.Litt.

*November 12.* "Some recent Essays on Indian Art and Life." By Douglas Ainslie.

*December 10.* "The Foreign Trade of China under Monopoly." By H. Ballou Morse, LL.D.

*January 14, 1919.* "The Haihayas and King Sagara." By F. E. Pargiter, M.A. (Vice-President).

*February 11.* "The House of the Morning." By Aylward M. Blackman, Litt.D.

*March 11.* "Alexander the Great and his Colonization of Asia." By F. Legge, F.S.A.

*April 8.* "Gesture in Prayer in the Religion of Babylonia and Adjacent Lands." By Stephen Langdon, Ph.D.

*Forlong Bequest Lectures.* Under the Forlong Bequest the following courses of lectures were arranged in conjunction with the Governors of the School of Oriental Studies for the past and present sessions :—

(a) A course of four lectures delivered by Mr. Yoshio Markino on "Ethics, Philosophy, and Religion".

# ABSTRACT OF RECEIPTS AND RECEIPTS.

	£	s.	d.	£	s.	d.
<b>SUBSCRIPTIONS...</b>				855	15	6
<b>Class A—60 at £3 3s.</b>	189	0	0			
Advance Subscriptions—1 at £3 3s.	3	3	0			
Completion (in arrears)	3	0				
1 Non-Resident and completion (£1 10s. and £1 13s.)	3	3	0			
1 Non-Resident completion	1	13	0			
3 reduced rate at £1 10s.	4	10	0			
16 S.B.A. in advance at £1 10s.	24	0	0			
<b>Class B—359 at £1 10s.</b>	538	10	0			
1 completion (£1 3s.)	1	3	0			
1 part payment (16s.)		15	0			
Advance Subscriptions—8 at £1 10s.	12	0	0			
In arrears—33 at £1 10s.	49	10	0			
<b>Class C—3 at £1 1s.</b>	3	3	0			
1 Library subscription at £1 10s.	1	10	0			
1 Non-Resident Compounder	23	12	6			
	<u>855</u>	<u>15</u>	<u>6</u>			
<b>RENTS RECEIVED</b>				210	15	2
<b>GRANT FROM INDIA OFFICE</b>				105	0	0
<b>DONATION</b>				10	8	1
<b>JOURNAL ACCOUNT</b>				318	0	0
Subscriptions	239	13	11			
Additional copies sold	68	9	0			
Advertisement	5	8	10			
Sale of Pamphlets	3	18	3			
Sale of Index	10	0				
	<u>318</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>0</u>			
<b>DIVIDENDS</b>				104	8	0
New South Wales 4 per cent Stock	32	2	0			
Midland Railway 2½ per cent Debenture Stock	3	18	4			
South Australian Government 3½ per cent Inscribed Stock, 1939	22	11	0			
New Zealand 4 per cent Stock	19	19	0			
War Loan 5 per cent	12	5	0			
Local Loans Stock	13	12	8			
	<u>104</u>	<u>8</u>	<u>0</u>			
<b>INTEREST ON DEPOSIT ACCOUNTS</b>				17	16	1
Lloyds Bank, Limited	14	19	4			
Post Office Savings Bank	2	16	9			
	<u>17</u>	<u>16</u>	<u>1</u>			
<b>SUNDRY RECEIPTS</b>				15	4	3
Balance in hand at January 1, 1918				546	3	4
				<u>£2,183</u>	<u>10</u>	<u>5</u>

## FUNDS.

£802 13s. 10d. New South Wales 4 per cent Stock.  
 £212 8s. Midland Railway 2½ per cent Debenture Stock.  
 £888 16s. 9d. South Australian Government 3½ per cent Inscribed Stock, 1939.  
 £454 16s. 9d. 3 per cent Local Loans Stock.  
 £297 7s. New Zealand Government 4 per cent Consolidated Stock, 1927.  
 £201 9s. 3d. New Zealand 4 per cent Stock, 1943-63.  
 £350 5 per cent War Loan, 1929-47.

# PAYMENTS FOR THE YEAR 1918

## PAYMENTS.

	£	s.	d.	£	s.	d.
HOUSE ACCOUNT ... ..				585	2	3
Rent ... ..	465	0	0			
Insurance ... ..	21	1	8			
Repairs ... ..	14	4	7			
Water Rate ... ..	16	0	0			
Gas and Electric Light ... ..	29	2	1			
Coals ... ..	7	13	0			
Telephone ... ..	8	8	8			
Other expenditure ... ..	23	12	3			
	585	2	3			
SALARIES AND WAGES ... ..				436	0	6
PRINTING AND STATIONERY ... ..				55	10	9
LIBRARY AND BOOKS ... ..				33	5	6
JOURNAL ACCOUNT ... ..				451	0	4
Printing ... ..	431	13	9			
Postage ... ..	19	6	7			
	451	0	4			
AUDITOR'S FEE ... ..				5	5	0
BANK CHARGES ... ..				15	0	
POSTAGE—Telegrams, etc. ... ..				31	9	5
SUNDRY PAYMENTS ... ..				11	3	6
RETURNED SUBSCRIPTION ... ..				1	10	0
BALANCE in hand at December 31, 1918—				572	8	2
Lloyds Bank, Limited ... ..	421	6	1			
Post Office Savings Bank ... ..	135	1	11			
Petty Cash ... ..	2	2	0			
Postage ... ..	13	18	2			
	572	8	2			

£2,183 10 5

We have examined the above Abstract of Receipts and Payments with the books and vouchers of the Society, and have verified the Investments therein described, and we hereby certify the said Abstract to be true and correct.

L. C. HOPKINS,  
for the Council.  
R. E. ENTHOVEN,  
for the Society.  
PRICE, WATERHOUSE & Co.,  
Professional Auditors.

J. KENNEDY, *Hon. Treasurer.*

*April, 1919.*

## SPECIAL FUNDS.

## RECEIPTS.

## PAYMENTS.

## ORIENTAL TRANSLATION FUND.

		1918.		1918.	
		£	s. d.	£	s. d.
Jan. 1.	Balance ...	459	17 3	1	12 6
	Sales ...	83	0 1	10	8 4
	Interest (incl. 4d. retd. cheques) ...	11	18 8	2	2 0
		94	18 9	2	2 6
				1	3 10
					15 16 8
					538 19 4
					<u>£554 16 0</u>

## PRIZE PUBLICATION FUND.

		Dec. 31.		Dec. 31.	
		£	s. d.	£	s. d.
Jan. 1.	Balance ...	197	4 3	3	4 11
	Sales ...	4	10 0	15	0
	Dividends ...	18	0 0		
	Interest ...	3	18 11		3 19 11
		26	8 11		219 13 3
					<u>£223 13 2</u>

## MONOGRAPH FUND.

		Dec. 31.		Dec. 31.	
		£	s. d.	£	s. d.
Jan. 1.	Balance ...	154	14 4	10	0
	Sales ...	13	1 0	1	1 0
	Interest ...	3	3 2		
		16	4 2		1 11 0
					169 7 6
					<u>£170 18 6</u>

## MEDAL FUND.

		Dec. 31.		Dec. 31.	
		£	s. d.	£	s. d.
Jan. 1.	Balance ...	61	5 2	28	10 0
	Dividends ...	9	15 0	2	16 3
	Interest ...	1	1 0		
		10	16 0		31 6 3
					40 14 11
					<u>£72 1 2</u>

[illegible]

ORIENTAL TRANSLATION FUND	...	538	19	4	Cash at Bankers—On Deposit Account	...	786	12	6
PRIZE PUBLICATION FUND	...	219	13	3	On Current Account	...	207	5	0
MONOGRAPH FUND	...	169	7	6					
MEDAL FUND	...	40	14	11					
PUBLIC SCHOOL MEDAL FUND	...	25	2	6					
		<u>4993</u>	<u>17</u>	<u>6</u>			<u>£993</u>	<u>17</u>	<u>6</u>

£600 Nottingham Corporation 3 per cent Irredeemable B Stock  
(Prize Publication Fund).  
£325 Nottingham Corporation 3 per cent Irredeemable A Stock  
(Medal Fund).  
£645 11s. 2d. Nottingham Corporation 3 per cent Irredeemable  
B Stock (Public School Medal Fund).

April, 1919.



# FORLONG BEQUEST

## ABSTRACT OF RECEIPTS AND PAYMENTS FOR THE YEAR 1918

RECEIPTS.		PAYMENTS.	
1918.	£ s. d.	£ s. d.	£ s. d.
<b>DIVIDENDS</b>			
Jan. 1.	161 16 3	Grant to Oriental School for Lectures	92 19 0
...	...	Bank charges	...
Bengal Nagpur Railway	29 5 9	Cash at Bankers, December 31, 1918—	...
South Australian Government	29 9 2	On Current Account	222 6 6
East India Railway Company	32 4 2	On Deposit Account	52 17 0
New South Wales	29 3 4		
India 3½ per cent	29 0 0		
War Loan 5 per cent, 1929-47	12 13 10		
	<u>161 16 3</u>		
Interest on Deposit Account	1 11 9		
Balance in hand at January 1, 1918	204 14 10		
	<u>£368 2 10</u>		

### FUNDS.

£1,010 Bengal Nagpur Railway 4 per cent Debenture Stock.  
 £1,015 16s. 3d. South Australian Government 4 per cent Inscribed Stock, 1940-60.  
 £45 East Indian Railway Company Annuity, Class "B",  
 £1,005 14s. 7d. New South Wales 4 per cent Stock, 1942-62.  
 £1,143 6s. 3d. India 3½ per cent Stock.  
 £253 18s. 4d. War Loan 5 per cent, 1929-47.

We have examined the above Abstract of Receipts and Payments with the books and vouchers of the Society and have verified the Investments therein described, and we hereby certify the said Abstract to be true and correct.

April, 1919.

J. KENNEDY, Hon. Treasurer.

L. C. HOPKINS, for the Council.  
 R. E. ENTHOVEN, for the Society.  
 PRICE, WATERHOUSE & Co., Professional Auditors.

- (b) A course of five lectures on "Central Asia" by Sir E. Denison Ross, C.I.E., Ph.D., Director S.O.S.
- (c) A course of five lectures on "Mesopotamia" by Mr. R. Campbell Thompson, M.A., F.S.A.

*Journal.* The great cost of printing has necessitated the cutting down of the Journal to a much reduced size, and in the July–October number for last year the expedient was resorted to of uniting the two numbers in one. It is, however, hoped that henceforth it may be possible to publish the Journal quarterly, although for the present its size must be kept within reduced limits.

*Monographs.* No monograph has appeared during the past twelve months, but the following are in course of preparation:—

(a) In the *Monograph Series*. Dr. M. Gaster reports that his work *El Asatir, or the Samaritan Apocalypse of Moses*, is approaching completion. The Rev. T. Grahame Bailey's *Linguistic Studies from the Himalayas* is in progress.

(b) In the *Prize Publication Fund Series* the following are going through the press: Sir George A. Grierson's *Iskasmī, Zēbukī, and Yāzghulāmī*, and Major D. L. R. Lorimer's *The Phonology of the Bakhtiāri, Badakshānī, and Muḍaglashti Dialects of Modern Persia* (with vocabularies).

In the *Indian Texts Series* two works that have been for a considerable time in preparation are now approaching completion and are likely to go to press without much further delay.

Dr. W. H. D. Rouse reports the completion of his *Translation of Çikṣāsamuccaya*. Mr. John Allan, who has been completing the *List of Indian Coin Finds* begun under the supervision of Professor Rapson and contributed to by Mr. G. F. Hill, states that his work on the *List*, though interrupted by the War, is likely to be finished early in the summer.

*Leipzig Exhibits.* An effort has been made, through the Public Trustee, to recover the valuable manuscripts and books lent before the outbreak of war to the Leipzig Book Exhibition. It is hoped that on the conclusion of peace these properties of the Society will be returned in safety.

*Public School Medal Competition.* The medal was won in 1918 by H. M. J. Jebb, of Eton, for an essay on "The Emperor Aurangzeb". There were four competitors. The medal was presented by the President, Lord Reay, to the successful candidate. This year, 1919, the medal has been gained by S. S. Bajpai, of Dulwich College, for an essay on "The Emperor Shah Jahan". Although only two essays were sent in, both attained a considerable degree of merit. It had been arranged to present the medal at the Anniversary Meeting, but the absence of the prize-winner in India has necessitated the postponement of the award.

The subject chosen for next year's competition (1919-20) is "The Rise, Decline, and Fall of the Marāthā Power". It is hoped that a larger number of competitors will come forward.

In November, 1918, it was agreed to support a movement to urge on the Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs the desirability of organizing the control of antiquities in the Near East, which, as a result of the War, had been occupied by the forces of the Entente, and that the opportunity offered by the Peace Conference should be taken, advantage of to put an end to the systematic destruction of antiquities and the obstruction of scientific exploration and excavation which have hitherto prevailed. The Council, feeling that the British Academy was the body most fitted to initiate such a movement, agreed to work in conjunction with this body and other learned societies to bring about these objects.

An appeal having been received from the Royal Society of Literature (Foreign Relations Committee), on behalf of the Universities and Public Libraries in Serbia devastated through the War, it was decided to offer to them a gift of all our available monographs and of a complete set of our Journals for the past ten years.

*Library.* Though some useful additions have come to the Library from the collection of the S.B.A., there are large gaps to be filled, and many books of great importance for Oriental studies are not to be found on our shelves. Parts of periodicals also are missing, and the Council have not been able of late years to allocate to the Library any adequate funds. It may not be realized by members that the Library is almost wholly dependent on books sent by publishers for review for additions to its catalogue. Gifts of suitable books to keep the Library up to date are earnestly to be desired. It is intended to publish from time to time in the Journal lists of important books or parts of periodical publications lost or wanted, in the hope that some of such gaps may be supplied by members and friends of the Society. A suggestion book will be found on the table in which books required by members may be written.

We appeal to members to return punctually books borrowed from the Library.

Under Rule 30 Professor Margoliouth, Litt.D., retires, after four years' service, from the office of Vice-President, the question of retirement as between him and Mr. M. Longworth Dames having been determined by lot. Dr. Vincent A. Smith, C.I.E., is recommended for election in his place.

Under Rule 32 the Right Hon. Syed Ameer Ali, C.I.E., and Mr. R. Sewell retire from the Council. The following are recommended for election: Sir Henry Howorth, K.C.I.E., Mr. F. Legge, F.S.A., Professor Margoliouth, Litt.D., Mr. W. H. Rylands, F.S.A.

Under Rule 81, Mr. L. C. Hopkins and Mrs. Frazer are nominated Auditors for the ensuing year.

Dr. F. W. THOMAS, in proposing the adoption of the Report, said that their first sentiment on hearing it must be one of satisfaction at the favourable situation in which they found themselves at the termination of the most disastrous war on record. They faced the future with a considerable increase of members, with their finances in a strong and sound position, and with ample work to do for the increased body of workers. It was, indeed, astonishing how little privation the Society as a Society had suffered from the War. Occasionally no doubt the diminished travelling facilities and the preoccupations of members had depleted their meetings, and they had noted a certain degree of rationing in the supply of the Journal and other reading matter. But, on the whole, those anxious four or five years had passed with singularly little diminution in their activities. They had continued to issue new publications, and if in the past year no fresh one had appeared, that was purely accidental, since several were in contemplation, or accepted for publication, or already in the press. The most important event of the year was the amalgamation with the Society of Biblical Archæology, which was a subject for unmixed congratulation. The fusion brought to them the honourable tradition of the Biblical Society's work, the stock of its publications, a large addition to the number of English members, an accession of strength to the Council, and last—and he might say least—a very acceptable and considerable sum in invested funds. (Laughter.) The amalgamation, which was always desirable, had taken place at the most opportune time. It was to be expected that in the immediate future the soil of those historic lands which lay between the East and the West and were known as the Near East, would yield up archæological

treasures in greater abundance than ever before. This new material would call for the utmost energies of all possible workers in the fields of study followed by the Society. Hence it was a fortunate coincidence that they had added to the members of the Society, and to those who governed its affairs, a strong contingent of scholars whose interests were primarily in the lands to which he referred.

He would like to say a word or two about their relations with the Société Asiatique and the American Oriental Society, the objects of which were fully set forth in the Journal for the first quarter of 1918. Seeing that in the near future the prospect of holding Oriental Congresses was likely to be less easy of realization, and seeing that it was undesirable that their activities should be confined within national limits, it was thought that by means of co-operation amongst the Societies in the leading Allied countries, something could be done to keep a quasi-international feeling alive. He would like to repudiate once more the idea that their association contemplated any exclusive policy with regard to scholarship. Their object was merely to carry through a certain amount of international co-operation during the transition period, and there was nothing in the arrangements made that was inconsistent with the subsequent inclusion of the Societies of any other country in the scheme. It was hoped that in the course of the present year they would be able to celebrate to some extent at least, in spite of certain difficulties, this association with the kindred French and American societies.

He would have been inclined to refer in some detail to the heavy losses to scholarship they had sustained by death but for the admirable manner in which this duty had been discharged in the report. With some of those they mourned he had ties of special friendship. Dr. Hoernle, to mention one name, was a man of the most remarkable

erudition and laboriousness. His literary activity was likely to be further evidenced by posthumous publications in addition to the large output which was chronicled in the Journal by Sir George Grierson. The death of Professor Windisch was deplored by many English friends who were aware of the sincere admiration which he had for English scholarship and how affectionately attached he was to his English friends. At the time of his death he had published the first part of his history of Indian philology, an extensive volume in which ample justice was done to the services of English scholars. Although he was not able to see the second volume through the press, there was reason to believe that it would appear in due course.

They greatly regretted that the time had come for Dr. Codrington to surrender the post of honorary librarian, which he had held for so many years. It was gratifying to know that he was being succeeded by Mr. Ellis, who would bring to the service of the Society an unrivalled familiarity with bibliography and library methods. It was a matter for great satisfaction that they were once more in the secure possession of a permanent secretary. (Cheers.) In the course of the last year or so the filling of the post had been a matter of considerable anxiety. Fortunately they had now secured in Miss Hull a lady of high literary attainments and exceedingly well qualified to carry out the work. (Cheers.) From some points of view it might seem regrettable that here also the rule seemed to have been established that man was unfit to act as Secretary of a learned Society. (Laughter.) But in the long régime of the present Mrs. Frazer they had learned to reconcile themselves to that position, and he had no doubt that the period of Miss Hull's services would be one of substantial progress.

Mr. GRANT BROWN said he was the least and most lately appointed of the members of the Council, but he believed that it was for that very reason that he was

asked to second the adoption of the Report. He wished first to draw attention to the paragraph in the Report regarding the library. As they could see, the library suffered from lack of accommodation; but there were many important books which they ought to have and which members had a right to expect should be there, but which for one reason or another they had not got. The Council hoped members would do their best to help to fill up the gaps. In particular there were series of publications of which there were numbers missing, including the Transactions of the International Congress of Orientalists at Stockholm and Christiania in 1889, at Rome in 1889, at Algiers in 1905, and at Copenhagen in 1908. Volumes iv, xii, xviii, xxi, and xxiii of the Gibb Memorial Series were also missing.

He might be wrong, but it seemed to him, in spite of some articles which had recently appeared, that the Society had come to be regarded as dealing almost exclusively with the past. This must tend to keep out desirable members and to make it more difficult to obtain funds. He did not mean to suggest that the Society should concern itself with politics or social reform in our Asiatic dependencies. That was rather the business of the East India Association and other bodies, and he thought the Royal Asiatic Society was rather concerned with learning for its own sake. But there was a very large field of investigation and research in spoken languages, in unwritten literature, in folklore and custom, which he would like to see much more extensively dealt with than it was at present, and especially by those who were still living in Asiatic countries. If they could get more contributions from them on these subjects, the Journal would be of more general interest, and they would increase their membership, besides having a larger field of selection in papers for the Journal. The difficulty was to find men who were both interested in such



matters and competent to write on them. Possibly they could not find them because they were not there to be found. If so, he thought this was in a large measure due to the unsuitability of the training given to officers sent out to the East.

In his opinion no Englishman should be sent to an Eastern country in Government service without thorough training in the art of distinguishing and representing spoken sounds. Such training would immensely facilitate the acquisition of spoken and especially of unwritten languages. If the learner was able to write down, in a scientific alphabet providing one symbol for each sound, the sounds that he heard, his task was enormously reduced, and he was at the same time preparing a valuable record. For, though philological research must take a low place as compared with the paramount importance of promoting an understanding between officials and those whom they ruled over or had dealings with, the advantage from a scientific point of view of having a body of men well equipped for both acquiring and recording spoken languages, all of which were constantly changing, while some were rapidly becoming extinct, was obviously very great. The need of recording such languages had been recognized by the appointment of Sir George Grierson to make a linguistic survey of the languages of India outside Burma, but he had been severely handicapped in his great task, now approaching completion, by the want of ear-training and ignorance of any generally recognized notation among those on whom he had to rely for the production of texts and vocabularies in the many languages dealt with. If the Indian Civil Service, not to mention other officials and workers among the people, had had the training which he suggested they should have, this work would have been greatly facilitated and its results made even more valuable. Nor was philology the only branch of

science which would have been benefited. The knowledge of spoken languages was a key to the study of customs and folklore, and even of literature, much of which was yet unwritten and nevertheless of real value.

Mr. BLAGDEN said that during the last four or five years they had passed through difficult times in connexion with their finance. Subscriptions fell off after the War broke out, while expenses increased, and these processes had been going on to some extent ever since. But owing to the great care with which their finances were nursed by Mr. Kennedy and, during his brief tenure, by Mr. Crewdson, their position was to-day satisfactory. Subscriptions to the Journal had increased this year by something like £25. There was a slight reduction in subscriptions, but with the accession of new members from the Society of Biblical Archæology they would be in a better position in the future. The rents received from sub-tenants were £30 more than they were two years ago. It was to be regretted that they were receiving from the India Office a subsidy of only 100 guineas as compared with 200 guineas before the War. The reduction had been a severe blow to them, and he trusted that the time was not far distant when the India Office would restore the grant to its former proportions. As to the present financial position, they had been able to retain their investments, and had recently made a small purchase of war loan. Their current balances were £25 more than they were twelve months ago. So he thought that they might congratulate themselves on the financial position of the Society, when they took into account the very serious times through which they had passed. He wished to add that he was in sympathy with the remarks of Mr. Grant Brown as to the importance of learning languages as they were spoken, and he was glad to be able to assure him that this question of phonetics was kept well to the fore at the School of Oriental Studies.

Professor HAGOPIAN expressed his gratification that the Society was co-operating with the British Academy and other bodies in pressing on the Government the importance of systematic archaeological research in the Near East. The peoples of the countries concerned who were interested in their past history, before the rise of Islam, had had tremendous difficulties placed in the way of attempts to investigate their past. Referring to Mr. Grant Brown's remarks, he said that it sometimes seemed to him that many Englishmen persisted in speaking native languages with English phonetics because they thought it to be beneath their dignity to speak them with the same intonations as the native. There were some Englishmen who attained this facility, but it was not a general rule.

THE PRESIDENT said he deeply regretted the deaths both of Dr. Hoernle and Mr. Crewdson. In the latter they had an ideal treasurer, and it was good to have in that capacity a man of business. Mr. Kennedy had always been ready to assist them whenever there was a vacancy in that department, which no one was keen to accept. Their thanks were due to Mrs. Frazer for her work as honorary assistant treasurer, and he was sorry to understand that now this link which united them with Mrs. Frazer was likely to be broken. As Mr. Blagden had shown, their finances were satisfactory.

He rejoiced in their amalgamation with the Society of Biblical Archaeology. It was a great pity that they ever were separate, and the younger body had brought to them very important auxiliaries. It was to be regretted that people were always starting new societies instead of strengthening those which existed. He was quite sure that a great many things that were neglected now might be achieved if the societies interested were united. By way of example he would mention the very good results achieved from University College and King's College

giving up their former rivalry and taking steps to prevent overlapping. The result has been the greatly increased prosperity of the University of London.

He wished to give a most cordial welcome to those who had been prominent in preparing the way for the merging of the two Societies, and especially to Mr. Legge, who had given his best thoughts and his personal efforts to make the amalgamation a success. He believed that for a long time to come the two Societies together would be able to constantly increase the efficiency of the Royal Asiatic Society.

This was their first anniversary meeting under the auspices of peace, and they were profoundly thankful that the cause for which they went to war had been vindicated. One of the most fortunate results of the War had been to spread the feeling between the various parts of our Empire that they were all one; that they all belonged, not to England, to Scotland, to Canada, or Australia, but to the British Empire. It was the time for every individual to show this feeling of unity. There never was a time in the history of the British Empire when it was more necessary than now for every class throughout the Empire to be as strong as possible; and it was only through the development of individual activity and effort that we should be able to go through the great crises by which we were surrounded.

While it was a matter for congratulation that the Public Schools Medal had been gained for the first time by an Indian, it was to be regretted that there were only two competitors. The fact that only two of the Public Schools competed indicated a lamentable neglect of Indian history. The Council had decided to issue a circular to the various schools calling their attention to the fact that the medal was annually given, and expressing a hope that there would be greater competition in the future.

Respecting the formation of a joint committee for the

preservation of antiquities in the Near East, the Society welcomed the fact that there was a great future for the archaeologist in many parts of the Near East where exploration and research were formerly difficult. They could look forward confidently to the development of the antiquities of those regions by the joint efforts of the British Academy, their own Society, and other bodies. He entirely agreed with Mr. Grant Brown that it was extremely important to develop the proper study of phonetics on an adequate scale. He hoped the efforts put forth in this direction would meet with every support. His own connexion with University College made him very keen about the success of any development of phonetic teaching.

Their thanks were due to Miss Hull for the way in which she had undertaken her duties. He hoped that the connexion of the Society with Miss Hull as Secretary would last quite as long a time as with her predecessor, Mrs. Frazer. (Cheers.)

The recommendations of the Report for the election of Vice-Presidents and of members of Council, and for the re-election of the President, Director, and honorary officers were unanimously confirmed.

THE PRESIDENT moved the appointment of Dr. A. Codrington as honorary Vice-President. He expressed regret that the address to be presented to Dr. Codrington was not yet completed by the printers who had undertaken its preparation. Through many years they had relied upon Dr. Codrington as their best friend and faithful guide through the library; and in many other respects he had been a link between the members and had promoted the most harmonious relations. They would miss his daily presence very much, and they would always welcome him most heartily whenever he visited them. (Cheers.)

Dr. CODRINGTON thanked the President for his kind

words, and said that though age had compelled his retirement he should be glad to render the Society any service he could in the future.

The election of Vice-Presidents, Members of Council, and Auditors, as recommended by the Council, was put to the meeting and unanimously carried.

The following officers were re-elected :—

Sir George A. Grierson, K.C.I.E., and Mr. Longworth Dames, as Joint Honorary Secretaries.

Mr. J. Kennedy as Honorary Treasurer.

Mr. E. G. Ellis was elected Honorary Librarian in the place of Dr. A. Codrington, resigned.

---

*June 17, 1919.*—The President in the Chair. The following were elected members of the Society :—

Mr. Nagendranath Biswas.

Mr. R. C. Culling Carr, I.C.S. (ret.).

Professor Samuel J. Crawford, B.A., B.Litt.

Mr. Colin Campbell Garbett, C.I.E., I.C.S.

Mr. Saya Tun Pé, M.A.

Mr. N. Padmanabha Pillai (Barrister-at-Law).

Mr. Vedāranyesvara V. Ramana Sastrin, Ph.D.

Miss Frances E. Newton, F.R.G.S., delivered a lecture, illustrated by slides, on “ A Journey into Arabia by the Hedjaz Railway ”.

Mr. H. St. J. B. Pilby moved a vote of thanks to the Lecturer, which was put by the President and carried.

---



## ADDITIONS TO THE LIBRARY

---

ARCHÆOLOGICAL SURVEY, BURMA. Report for year ending  
March 31, 1918. *From the Government of India.*

ARCHÆOLOGICAL SURVEY OF INDIA. Eastern Circle. Annual  
Report, 1917-18. *Patna, 1918.*

*From Superintendent Government Printing, Bihar and Orissa.*

— Annual Report, 1916-17, pt. i.—Western Circle, to  
March 31, 1918. *From the Government of India.*

Augi  ras, Capitaine. Le Sahara Occidental, avec une carte  
hors texte. Masson et Cie. *Paris, 1919.*

*From the Soci  t   de G  ographie.*

BULLETIN DE LA COMMISSION ARCH  OLOGIQUE DE L'INDO-  
CHINE. Ann  es 1914-16. Minist  re de l'Instruction  
publique and des Beaux Arts. *Paris, 1916.*

*From the Publisher.*

Busbequii, A. Gisl  nii. Omnia quae extrant. Cum Privilegio.  
Lugd. Batavorum ex officina Elzeviriana. Anno 1638.

*Presented by Mr. H. Beveridge.*

Campos, J. J. A. History of the Portuguese in Bengal. With  
an introduction by the Hon. Mr. F. J. Monahan. Index,  
maps, and illustrations. *London, 1919.*

*From the Publishers.*

Candler, E. The Sepoy. Illustrated. *London, 1919.*

*From the Publisher.*

CENTRAL PROVINCES AND BERAR, REPORT ON THE ADMINIS-  
TRATION OF THE, 1917-18. *Nagpur, 1919.*

*From the India Office.*

Creswell, Capt. K. A. C. A Brief Chronology of the  
Muhammadian Monuments of Egypt to A.D. 1517. (Extrait  
du Bulletin de l'Institut Fran  ais d'Arch  ologie Orientale,  
t. xvi.) *Le Caire, 1919.*

*From the Author.*



**DASTUR HOSHANG MEMORIAL VOLUME, THE.** Being papers on Iranian subjects written by various scholars in honour of the late Shams-ul-Ulma Sardar Dastur Hoshang Jamasp. *Bombay, 1918.*

*Presented by the Trustees of the Parsee Panchayet Funds.*

**Forster, C. T. and Daniell, F. H. B.** Life and Letters of Ogier Ghiselin de Busbecq. 2 vols. *London, 1881.*

*Presented by Mr. H. Beveridge.*

**GAZETTEER.** Shahabad District. B vol., 1900-1 to 1910-11.

— United Provinces. B vol. Rampur State.

**GEOLOGICAL SURVEY OF INDIA, MEMOIRS OF THE.** Vol. xlii, pt. ii; vol. xlv, pt. i. *London, 1917.*

*From the Government of India.*

**GEOLOGICAL SURVEY OF INDIA, RECORDS OF THE.** Vol. xlviii, pts. i, iii, iv, 1917. Maps. Vol. xlix, pts. i, iii, 1918. Maps and plates. *London, 1917.*

*From the Government of India.*

**HINDU AND BUDDHIST MONUMENTS.** Northern Circle. Annual Progress Report, March 31, 1918. *Lahore, 1918.*

*From the Government of India.*

**INDIAN COTTON COMMITTEE, REPORT OF THE.** Map and plans. 1919.

*From the Government of India.*

**INDIAN EDUCATION IN 1917-18.** Bureau of Education, India.

*From the Government of India.*

**Kiliaan, H. N.** Javaansche Spraakkunst. 's *Gravenhage, 1919.*

**Kimchi, Joseph.** Shekel Hakodesh (The Holy Shekel), edited for the first time from MSS. at the Bodleian, to which is added Yesod Hayirah (The Foundation of Religious Fear), from MSS. in the British Museum. With an English translation and notes by HERMAN GOLLANCZ. 1919.

*From the Publisher.*

**Lenormant, François.** Histoire Ancienne de l'Orient jusqu'aux Guerres Médiques. Neuvième édition. 6 vols. *Paris, 1881.*

*Presented by Mr. W. H. Rylands.*

**Macoudi.** Les Prairies d'Or. Texte et Traduction par C. B. de Meynard et P. de Courteille. 9 vols. *Paris*, 1861.

*Presented by Sir Henry Howorth.*

**Martineau, Alfred.** Les Origines de Mahé de Malabar. Extrait de la Revue de l'Histoire des Colonies Françaises, 1<sup>er</sup>, 2<sup>e</sup>, et 4<sup>e</sup> Trimestres, 1916. Maps and plans. *Paris*, 1917.

*From the Société de l'Histoire des Colonies Françaises.*

**Mookerji Radhakumud Vidyavaibhava.** Local Government in Ancient India. With foreword by the Marquess of Crewe, K.G. *Oxford*, 1919.

*From the Publishers.*

**MURRAY'S HANDBOOK FOR TRAVELLERS IN INDIA, BURMA, AND CEYLON.** Tenth edition. With 79 maps and plans. *London*, 1919.

*Presented by the Publisher.*

**MYSORE ARCHÆOLOGICAL DEPARTMENT.** Annual Report, 1918.

*From the Government Press, Bangalore.*

**Nariman, G. K.** Iranian Influence on Moslem Literature. Pt. i. Translated from the Russian of M. Inostranzen, with supplementary appendices from Arabic sources. *Bombay*, 1918.

*Presented by Trustees of the Parsee Punchayet Funds.*

**Parmentier, H.** Inventaire Descriptif des Monuments Čams de l'Annam. Publications de l'École Française d'Extrême-Orient. Tome ii : Étude de l'Art Čam. Planches d'après les relevés et les dessins de l'auteur. 2<sup>e</sup> série. *Paris*, 1918.

*Presented by the Publisher.*

**Pithawalla, M. B.** Rock Records of Darius the Great. *Poona*, 1918.

*Presented by Trustees of the Parsee Punchayet Funds.*

**PROCEEDINGS SOCIETY OF BIBLICAL ARCHÆOLOGY.** Vols. xvi-xl. (Missing vol. xx, pt. vii ; vol. xxii, pts. iv, v).

*From Mr. Mortimer Rooke.*

**Reischauer, August Karl.** Studies in Japanese Buddhism.

*New York*, 1917.

REPORT ON THE ADMINISTRATION OF LAND REVENUE, LAND RECORDS AND AGRICULTURE, ESTATES UNDER THE COURT OF WARDS, GOVERNMENT LITIGATION AND THE ALIENATION OF LAND ACT IN THE NORTH-WEST FRONTIER PROVINCE, 1917-18. *Peshawar*, 1919.

*From the Government of India.*

Sakulchand, Choonilal. Jain Religious Literature. *Bombay*.

*From the Publisher.*

SANSKRIT MSS. IN THE GOVERNMENT ORIENTAL MSS. LIBRARY, MADRAS. Descriptive Catalogue by S. Kuppaswami Sastri. Vol. xxii: Rhetoric, Poetics, Music, Dancing, and Silpasastra. Vol. xxiii: Medicine. Vol. xxiv: Jyautisa. *Madras*, 1918.

*From the Government Press, Madras.*

Sarda, Har Bilas. Maharana Sāngā, the Hindupat. The last great Leader of the Rajput Race. *Ajmer*, 1918.

*From the Author.*

Sen, Priyanath. The General Principles of Hindu Jurisprudence. Tagore Law Lectures. 1909. *University of Calcutta*, 1918.

*From the Publishers.*

Shibusawa, Baron Eiichi. Life of Prince Yoshinobu Tokugawa (the last Shogun). 7 vols. *Tokyo*. Presented by T. Doki.

SIMON HEWAVITARNE BEQUEST.

Paramattha Dīpanī, or the Commentary of the Peta-Vatthu.

Sumangalavilasini, or the Commentary of the Dīghanikāya of the Sutta Pitaka. Part i.

Paramattha Dīpanī, or the Commentary of the Therī-Gāthā.

Paramattha Dīpanī, or the Commentary of the Thera-Gāthā.

*Colombo*, 1917-19.

*From the Trustees.*

SURVEY OF INDIA, RECORDS OF THE. Vol. viii, pt. i. Exploration in Tibet and Neighbouring Regions, 1865-79. Pt. ii, 1879-92. Prepared under the direction of Col. Sir S. G. Burrard, K.C.S.I. Frontispiece and maps. *Dehra Dun*, 1915.

*From Surveyor-General of India.*

Torū, R. Journal of the College of Science, Imperial University of Tokyo. Les Aïnou des Iles Kouriles. Vol. xlii, pt. i, January, 1919. *Tokyo*.

*From the Publishers.*

UNITED STATES NATIONAL MUSEUM, REPORT ON THE PROGRESS  
AND CONDITION OF THE, for the year ending June 30, 1918.  
*Washington, 1919. From the Publishers.*

Venkataswami, M. N. Tulsemmah and Nagaya or Folk-stories  
from India. *Madras, 1918. From the Publishers.*

Walter, H. A. The Ahmadiya Movement. The Religious  
Life of India. *Oxford University Press, 1919.*  
*From the Publishers.*

Wickremasinghe, M. de Z. Epigraphia Zeylanica, being Lithic  
and other inscriptions of Ceylon. Archaeological Survey of  
Ceylon. Vol. ii, pt. iv, 1917.

Willcocks, Sir William. The Nile Projects. *Cairo, 1919.*  
*From the Author.*

## PAMPHLETS

Asakawa, K. Some Aspects of Japanese Feudal Institutions.  
*From the Author.*

Deb, Harit Krishna. Asoka's Dhammalipis Udayana Vatsa-  
Raja. 1919. *From the Author.*

Debreuil, G. Jouveau. Conjeevaram Inscription of Mahêndra-  
varman I. *Trichinopoly, 1919. From the Author.*

Furlani, G. Le "Questioni filosofiche" di Abū Zakariyā  
Yahyā b. 'Adī. *Roma, 1919. From the Author.*

Grant, Elihu. Babylonian Business Documents of the Classical  
Period. *Philadelphia, 1919. From the Author.*

Kaye, G. R. Influence Grecque dans le Développement des  
Mathématiques Hindoues. Reprint from *Scientia.*  
*From the Author.*

Landberg, C. de. Langue des Bédouins 'Anazeh. Texte Arabe  
avec Traduction, Commentaire, et Glossaire. Préface et  
1<sup>re</sup> partie. *Leide, 1919.*

Law, B. C. A short account of the Wandering Teachers  
at the time of the Buddha. *From the Author.*

- Salford, Bishop of.** A Problem of After-war Reconstruction :  
The Study of Foreign Languages. Read before Manchester  
Statistical Society, March 12, 1919. *Manchester.*  
*From the Author.*

## PERIODICALS

- American Philological Association, Transactions of the Vol.  
xlviii, 1917.  
Bradley (C. B.). The History of the Sukhōthai Letters.  
Lanman (C. R.). Hindu Ascetics and their Powers.  
American Philosophical Society, Proceedings of the Vol. lvii,  
No. vii, 1918.  
Annual Report of the Archæological Department of His Exalted  
Highness the Nizam's Dominions. 1826 F. 1916-17 A.D.  
Plates. *Calcutta*, 1918.  
*From Hyderabad Archæological Society.*  
Archives d'Études Orientales publiées par J. A. Lundell.  
Vol. xiv. *Upsala*, 1918.  
Christensen (Arthur). Le premier homme et le premier roi  
dans l'histoire légendaire des Iraniens. I.  
— Vol. xv, i, 1915 ; ii, 1916 ; iii, 1919.  
Karlgren (Bernhard). Études sur la Phonologie Chinoise.  
Asia, Journal of the American Asiatic Association. *June*, 1919.  
Asiatic Review, The. Vol. xv, No. xliii, July, 1919.  
Gaubā (K.). Indian Literature : Past, Present, and Future.  
Sharrock (Rev. J. A.). Caste as a Factor in Indian Reform.  
Parker (Prof. E. H.). Law and other Reforms in China.  
Asiatic Society of Bengal, Journal and Proceedings. New  
Series. Vol. xiv, Nos. v-ix, 1918.  
Beveridge (H.). The Rauzat-ut-Tāharīn Vidyabhusana  
(Mahāmahopādhyāya S. C.). The Tattvacintāmani, a most  
advanced work on Hindu Logic.  
Law (B. C.). Short Account of the Wandering 'Teachers at  
the Time of the Buddhas.  
Notes on Important Arabic and Persian MSS. found in various  
libraries in India. II.

Haig (Lieut.-Col. T. W.). The Poet Shaikh Mufakhkhar-al-din-Āzarī of Isfarāyin.

Asiatic Society of Bengal, Journal and Proceedings. New Series. Vol. xv, No. i, 1919.

Aziz (Md. A.). On the Identification of the ancient Town of Tagara.

Tessitori (Dr. L. P.). Progress Report on the work done during 1917 in connexion with the Bardic and Historical Survey of Rajputana.

Bengal Past and Present. Vol. xv, pt. ii, Serial No. xxx, October-December, 1917.

The Nesbitt Thompson Papers. II. (*To be continued.*)

Das Gupta (J. N.). Wellesley's Plan for the Improvement of Indian Agriculture.

Das Gupta (J. N.). Wellesley's Scheme for the Improvement of Calcutta.

Monahan (F. J.). Early History of Bengal. V.

The Letters of Mr. Richard Barwell. XIII. (*To be continued.*)

— Vol. xvi, pt. ii, No. xxxii, April-June, 1918.

Letter from George Cornish, A.D.C., to Sir John Shore, Governor-General, during an official tour in 1797.

A Note on Jean Baptiste Chevalier and Colonel de Montigny.

The Dutch Cemetery at Chinsurah.

The Nesbitt Thompson Papers. III.

Bihar and Orissa Research Society, Journal of, Index. Vol. iv, 1918. 3 plates.

Bijdragen tot de Taal-land en Volkenkunde van Nederlandsch-Indië. Deel lxxiv, 1918.

Ronkel (S. van). Mededeelingen aangaande een palataliseerend Minangkabausch dialect.

Krom (N. J.). De Bodhisattwa's van den Mëndut.

Bulletin de l'École Française d'Extrême Orient. Tome xviii, No. ix.

Cœdès (George). Etudes Cambodgiennes.

— No. x, 1918.

Parmentier (H.). Le tombeau de Nghi-vê.

Cœdès (G.). A propos des anciens noms de Luang Prabang.

Finot (L.). Deux nouvelles inscriptions Indochinoises.

Calcutta Review. No. cclxv, January, 1919.

Gilchrist (R. N.). Indian Nationality.

Underwood (A. C.). Chaitanya and the Vaisnavas of Bengal.

Peris (M. M.). Jain Antiquities of Southern India.

Birt (F. B. Bradley). The Danes at Serampore.

Ceylon Antiquary and Literary Register. Vol. iv, pt. iv, April, 1919.

Lewis (J. P.). The Tragedy and Problem of Major Davie.

Methley (Miss V. M.). The Davie Letters, with Notes.

Turner (L. J. B.). Some Aspects of the Economics of the Maritime Provinces of Ceylon 1798-1805.

Rao (C. Hayavadana) and Turner (L. J. B.). The Madras Administration of the Maritime Provinces of Ceylon.

S. G. P. The British Occupation of the Maritime Provinces of Ceylon, 1795-6.

Congrès Français de la Syrie (3, 4, et 5 Janvier, 1919).

Chambre de Commerce de Marseille. Séances et Travaux. Fascicule II. *Paris*.

Gérin-Ricard (Comte de). Acte de souveraineté de Charles I<sup>er</sup> d'Anjou, comme roi de Jérusalem 1284.

Durrieu (Comte Paul). Le Titre de "Roi de Jérusalem" et la France.

Bréhier (Louis). Les Origines des rapports entre la France et la Syrie. Le Protectorat de Charlemagne.

Pillet (M.). Les Premières Recherches historiques dans la Région de Mossoul. Les Sites Antiques et les Monuments Historiques.

Duprat (Eugène). Les Relations de la Provence et du Levant du V<sup>e</sup> Siècle aux Croisades.

L'Abbaye de Saint Victor et la Palestine aux temps des Croisades.

Dussaud (René). Simyra et l'importance de la Côte nord de Syrie dans l'Antiquité.

Macler (Frédéric). Les Arméniens en Syrie et en Palestine.

Geographical Journal. Vol. liii, No. v, May, 1919.

Noel (Major J. B.). A Journey to Tashirak in Southern Tibet, and the Eastern Approaches to Mount Everest.

Geographical Journal. Vol. liii, No. vi, June, 1919.

Buchanan (Lieut.-Col. Sir Walter). A Recent Trip into the Chumbi Valley, Tibet.

— Vol. liv, No. i, July, 1919.

— Vol. liv, No. ii, August, 1919.

Sowerby (Capt. A. de C.). The Exploration of Manchuria.

Stein (Sir Aurel). Marco Polo's account of a Mongol Inroad into Kashmir.

Geological Survey of India. Records. Vol. xlviii, pts. i, iii, iv, 1917.

— Vol. xlix, pts. i, iii, 1918.

Hyderabad Archæological Series. No. III: Inscriptions at Palampet and Uparpulli. Plates. *Calcutta*, 1919.

Hyderabad Archæological Society, Journal of the, 1918.

McClay (A. G.). Monsieur Raymond of Hyderabad.

Streenivas (T.). Old Masulipatam.

Yazdani (G.). Mahur: its History and Monuments.

Sarkar (Prof. Jadu Nath). The Siege and Capture of Golconda.

Yazdani (G.). The date of Sultan Quli Qutb-ul-Mulk's assuming the title of Shah.

Indian Antiquary. Vol. xlvii, pt. dxcvi, June, 1918.

Haig (Lieut.-Col. T. W.). The Faruqi Dynasty of Khandesh.

Bhandarkar (D. R.). Dekkan of the Satavahana Period.

Jacobi (H.). On the Authenticity of the Kautiliya. Translated by V. S. Sukthankar.

Majumdar (R.). Revised Chronology of the last Gupta Emperors.

— Vol. xlvii, pt. dxcvii, July, 1918.

Creswell (Capt. K. A. C.). Vaulting System of the Hindola Mahal at Mandu.

Haig (Lieut.-Col. T. W.). The Faruqi Dynasty of Khandesh.

Jacobi (H.). On the Authenticity of the Kautiliya. Translated by V. S. Sukthankar.

— Vol. xlvii, pts. dxcviii and dxcix, August and September, 1918.

Carter (G. E. L.). Religion in Sind.



- Sarkur (Guru Das). Alleged Buddhist Influence in the Sun Temple at Konarak.
- Tessitori (L. P.). The wide sound of *e* and *o* in Mawari and Gujarati.
- Law (Narendra Nath). Vārttā — the Ancient Hindu Economics.
- Garde (M. B.). A Note on the Yajvapālas or Jajapellas of Narwar.
- Utgikar (N. B.). The Bhagavadgītā in its original form.
- Jewish Quarterly Review. Vol. x, No. i, July, 1919.
- Wolfson (H. A.). Note on Crescas's Definition of Time.
- Waxman (M.). The Philosophy of Don Hasdai Crescas.
- Friedenwald (H.). Note on the Importance of the Hebrew Language in Mediaeval Medicine.
- Zeitlin (S.). Megillat Taanit as a source for Jewish Chronology and History in the Hellenistic and Roman Periods.
- Hoschander (Jacob). The Book of Esther in the Light of History.
- Mann (Jacob). The Responsa of the Babylonian Geonim as a source of Jewish History.
- Journal Asiatique. Série xi, Tome xii, No. iii, Nov.-Déc. 1918.
- Bel (M. A.). Inscriptions Arabes de Fès.
- Przyluski (M.). Le Parinirvāna et les funérailles du Buddha (*suite*).
- Cazanova (M.). Mélanges : Le joyau d'Haroûn ar Rachîd.
- Journal of the American Oriental Society. Vol. xxxix, pt. ii, April, 1919.
- Albright (W. F.). Some Cruces in the Langdon Epic.
- Nies (James B.). Origin of Maš or Bar and the Development of its Meanings.
- Brown (George William). Prāna and Apāna.
- Vol. xxxix, pt. iii, June, 1919.
- Breasted (J. H.). The Place of the Near Orient in the Career of Man and the Task of the American Orientalist.

- Worrell (W. H.). An Account of Schools for Living Oriental Languages established in Europe.
- Lutz (H. F.). The D D-Emblem of Osiris.
- Journal of the Royal Anthropological Institute of Great Britain and Ireland. Vol. xlviii, 1918, July to December.
- Evans (Ivor H. N.). Some Sakai Beliefs and Customs.
- Panikkar (K. M.). Some Aspects of Nāyar Life.
- Korea Magazine. April, 1919.
- L'Histoire des Colonies Françaises. Revue de 2<sup>e</sup> Année, 1914. iii<sup>e</sup> et iv<sup>e</sup> Trimestres.
- Guénin (Eugène). Chute de Chandernagor et perte du Bengale.
- Maha-Bodhi and the United Buddhist World. Vol. xxvii, January-March, 1919, Nos. i-iii.
- The Anagarika H. Dharmapala: India two thousand five hundred years ago.
- Museum Journal. Vol. ix, Nos. iii and iv, Sept.-Dec. 1918.
- Bishop (C. W.). The Horses of T'ang T'ai-Tsung.
- Museum of Fine Arts Bulletin. Boston. Vol. xvii, No. ci, June, 1919.
- New China Review. Vol. i, No. i, March, 1919. Edited by Samuel Couling, M.A.
- Editor (The). Edouard Chavannes.
- Yetts (Major W. Perceval). Taoist Tales.
- Morse (Hosea B.). A Short-lived Republic.
- Ross (Sir E. D.). A School of Oriental Languages.
- Doré (R. P. Henri). Le Grand Pèlerinage Bouddhique de Lang-chan.
- Cornaby (W. Arthur). Notes on the Chinese Drama and Ancient Choral Dances.
- Chatley (Herbert). Studies in Chinese Psychology.
- Numismatic Chronicle. Fourth Series, No. lxxiii, Pt. i, 1919.
- Rogers (Edgar). Three rare Seleucid Coins and their problems.
- Palestine Exploration Fund. July, 1919.
- Offord (J.). On-Anu, Heliopolis in a Semitic Inscription; and the Gilgals and Massebahs of Palestine.

Princeton Theological Review. Vol. xvii, April, 1919, No. ii.

Quarterly Journal of the Mythic Society (Bangalore). Vol. ix, No. iii, April, 1919.

Richards (F. J.). Some Brahmanic Temples and Temple Worship in Salem District, South India.

Josyer (G. R.). Tippu Sultan from a Contemporary Memoir.

Rathnaswamy (M.). The Nomads in India (A Study of Turkish Rule in India).

Répertoire d'Épigraphie Sémitique. Académie des Inscriptions et Belles-Lettres. Tome ii, 4<sup>me</sup> livraison (Tables), 1914; Tome iii, 1<sup>re</sup> livr. (1201-1510), 1916; 2<sup>me</sup> livr. (1511-1924), 1917; 3<sup>me</sup> livr. (1925-2000, Tables), 1918.

Revue d'Assyriologie et d'Archéologie Orientale. Vol. XV, Nos. iii-iv.

Scheil (V.). Vocabulaire de pierres et d'objets en pierre (avec 2 planches).

Revue de l'Histoire des Religions, publiée sous la direction de MM. René Dussaud et Paul Alphandéry. Annales du Musée Guimet. Tome lxxvi, No. i, Juillet-Août.

Ebersolt (Jean). Mélanges byzantins.

— Tome lxxvi, No. ii, Septembre-Octobre.

Dussaud (René). Les dates des prophéties d'Ezéchiel.

Mele (A.). Le epistole paoline nei loro rapporti con l'evangelio.

— Tome lxxvi, No. iii, Novembre-Décembre.

Vernes (Maurice). Le sanctuaire moabite de Bèth-Péor.

— Tome lxxvii, No. 1, Janvier-Février.

Huet (G.). Les Origines du conte d'Aladdin et la lampe merveilleuse.

Alfaric (P.). Les Ecritures manichéennes. I.

— Tome lxxvii, No. ii, Mars-Avril.

Humbert (Paul). Les trois premiers chapitres d'O'sée.

Vernes (M.). Les Étapes de la déification de Jésus dans les livres du Nouveau Testament.

Alfaric (P.). Les Ecritures manichéennes. II.

- Revue de l'Histoire des Religions. Tome lxxvii, No. iii, Mai-Juin.  
Ebersolt (Jean). Les anciens sanctuaires éthiopiens.  
Gaudefroy-Demombynes. Notes sur La Mekke et Médine.  
Alfaric (P.). Les Ecritures manichéennes. III.
- Rivista degli Studi Orientali, pubblicata a cura dei Professori  
della Scuola Orientale nella R. Università di Roma.  
Vol. viii, fasc. primo.
- Nallinro (C. A.). Il poema mistico arabo d'Ibn al-Fārid in  
una recente traduzione italiana.
- Krenkow (F.). Il "Libro delle Classi" di Abū Bakr az-  
Zubaidi.
- Furlani (G.). Le "Question filosofiche" di Abū Zakariyā  
Yahya b. 'Adī.
- Sphinx. Vol. xxi, fasc. i. Upsala.
- Naville (Edouard). Le Sphinx, III.
- Farina (Giulio). Minima.
- Tōyō-Gakuho. Vol. ix, No. ii, June, 1919.
- Iijima (T.). A further discussion on the date when Tso-  
ch'uan was written.
- Katō (S.). Distinctions made during the Han Dynasty between  
the National Finance and the Imperial Household Economy,  
and a general view of the latter. (*Concluded.*)
- Ikéuchi (Bungakushi H.). Ta-hua Kang, a Corean Royal  
Palace and a Fort by the name of "Wo-ch'eng" (Japanese  
Castle).
- Transactions of the Royal Historical Society. 4th series.  
Vol. i, 1918.
-



JOURNAL  
OF THE  
ROYAL ASIATIC SOCIETY  
1919

---

XV

THE ARYAN INVASION OF NORTHERN INDIA: AN  
ESSAY IN ETHNOLOGY AND HISTORY

By JAMES KENNEDY

ETHNOLOGISTS divide the Indian Āryas into two groups, the Indo-Aryan and the Aryo-Dravidian. The Indo-Aryans occupy the Indus basin, that is to say the greater part of the Panjab; and they have colonized a considerable part of Northern and Central Rajputana. They are homogeneous, more homogeneous than the English, who are the most homogeneous people in Europe; and that, despite various foreign invaders, who have settled among them within historic times, and whom they have assimilated. Prince and peasant differ little in their physical build.

The Aryo-Dravidians (so-called, for the propriety of the name is sometimes questioned) inhabit the valley of the Middle Ganges; they extend from Sirhind to the Eastern confines of Bihar; and their country is the classical Hindustan. The Aryo-Dravidians have received few accretions from the outside world, and yet they are essentially disharmonic; they show every sign of an incomplete fusion of races, a fusion which has been forcibly interrupted. It is not only between different castes or different localities that we perceive this disparity;

it can be observed within the caste. One-third of the Brahmans in the United Provinces are over 5 ft. 7 in.; one-third are below 5 ft. 5 in. We see Brahmans that are fair, while others have the complexion of an Ethiop.

These divergent types, the Indo-Aryan and the Aryo-Dravidian, were fixed before the Greeks had heard of India; they go back to the days of the *Rig Veda*, the *Brāhmaṇas*, and the *Upanishads*. It is the business of the historian to inquire into the causes which led to this differentiation of the Aryan race, and to show what each group has contributed to the subsequent development of Indian life and history. But the subject is obscure; the "iniquity of time" has blurred or destroyed the details; and much is necessarily conjectural. Archæology affords no aid, for we are dealing with a primitive people which, owing to the nature of the soil, has left us no remains. Incidental references, which are only too rare, in the hymns of the *Rig Veda* and in the subsequent Vedic literature, sum up our positive knowledge. The Puranic literature undoubtedly contains traditions of a time much earlier than its own, but this literature itself is late, and it has not been found possible to disentangle these traditions from the divine myths which strangle them.

The historian has, however, one auxiliary on which he can rely with some assurance. In the morning of the world nature, which is now man's ally, was primitive man's chief enemy, sometimes benign, but oftener malignant; it over-arched his life and determined all his movements. The physical conditions of Northern India are the same now as they were four thousand years ago; and I think it is possible to find in the physical differences between the Indus basin and the Gangetic valley a clue to much of this early history. We know that certain causes must have powerfully affected these primitive men; and we shall see that the results are such as might have been expected.

The Aryan invasion of India was part of a much more extensive migration. Our subject therefore falls into three compartments. In the first I shall speak of the relation of these Indian Āryas to their Iranian cousins, and to the Dravidians among whom the Āryas settled. In the second I shall try to trace the various stages in the occupation of the Panjab and of Hindustan, and show how the division between Indo-Aryans and Aryo-Dravidians arose. Lastly I propose to say something of the new society to which the admixture of Aryan and Dravidian gave birth.

# I

Soon after the commencement of the second millennium B.C. there began a great movement southward of Scythic tribes from Western Turkestan. They crossed the mountain barrier which extends from the Caucasus to the Hindu Kush, and settled on the borders of the Iranian plateau, from which they were destined in the course of time to dominate the peoples of the plains below. Whether this movement was due to the desiccation of the country watered by the Oxus, or to some other cause, we cannot say; certain it is that the cause was permanent, and the movement lasted over several centuries.<sup>1</sup> These Scyths called themselves Āryas, the "noble" or "illustrious", a title such as is common among primitive peoples; and they became the ancestors of the Medes, the Persians, and the Indian Āryas.

Nature dictated the routes which these nomads followed. The neighbourhood of the Caspian Sea abounds in prehistoric remains. Leaving this civilization, whatever it may have been at the time, and the wooded slopes of Mazenderan behind them, the Medes settled to the south-east of Lake Urmi in Azerbaijan and Media. The Persians further east crossed the mountain barrier where

<sup>1</sup> According to de Morgan (*Les Premières Civilisations*, p. 314) it ended some time between 1500 and 1200 B.C.



the passage is easiest, and traversing Seistan and Carmania they occupied the fertile valleys about Persepolis. Here they became the neighbours of the Cassites, whom they may have aided in the subsequent conquest of Babylon. The Indian Āryas moving from Bactria crossed the passes of the Hindu Kush, and entered the Panjab through Afghanistan.

The movement of the Indian Āryas from their fertile seats in Bactria and on the banks of the Oxus may have been hastened by the pressure of Medic tribes coming from the west. It would seem as if only a section of the Medes had crossed the mountains to the Iranian plateau. The rest spread eastwards along the bases of the hills until they had occupied Bactria and the greater part of Arachosia. Free from all contact with foreign elements they became the most conservative of the Iranian race. The practice of exposing the corpse to birds and beasts of prey, the worship of fire, the oldest forms of Medic speech had their especial home in North-East Iran. With the Persians these Medic tribes seem to have had little affinity, while they were closely connected with the Western Medes. They were a bulwark against the nomads whom they fought and civilized, and through them North-East Iran became completely Iranian.

Neither Persians, Medes, nor Indian Āryas retained any tradition of these migrations.<sup>1</sup> The lofty Iranian plateau, on the fringe of which the two former had settled, was practically empty of inhabitants in neolithic times.<sup>2</sup> Only the western slopes of the Zagros range and the hills which skirt the Persian Gulf had any inhabitants, and the tribes which occupied them were un-Aryan in

<sup>1</sup> The attempts to find any trace of them in the Vendidad or Rig Veda are now, I think, generally abandoned. For the Vendidad see Darmesteter, S.B.E. *The Zend Avesta*, i, pp. 1-2; and for the Rig Veda, Hopkins, *Religions of India*, pp. 15, 30.

<sup>2</sup> De Morgan, *op. cit.*, p. 266.

language and in race.<sup>1</sup> We do not know whether Afghanistan was equally void. In all probability it was sparsely occupied by small groups of the Armenoid variety of the Alpine race. In some prehistoric age such Alpine men from the Suleman range descended upon the West coast of India, and became the ancestors of the Mahrattas and other mixed peoples of the Dekhan.<sup>2</sup> We may conjecture that the transit of the Āryas through Afghanistan put them in motion; but this is conjecture and not knowledge.

The Indian Āryas, facing eastwards, lost all recollection of their Persian and Medic brethren who had travelled west. The Iranian desert intervened, and divergencies arose in language and religion. But we are now able with the aid of philology and ethnology to establish their identity.

Who, then, were these Āryas? Originally they had all called themselves Āryas; it was the designation by which they were distinguished from all the other dwellers of the steppes. The Indian Āryas being the most conservative never dropped the name; it lingered in Media down to the time of Herodotus, and Darius Hystaspes, a Persian, calls himself an Ārya on his tomb.<sup>3</sup> Sanskrit and Avestic, the languages which they spoke, are derived from a common speech;<sup>4</sup> and the gods Indra,

<sup>1</sup> Armenians, Kurds, Cassites, Elamites with Sumerians in Babylonia, and Arabs on the eastern shores of the Persian Gulf. The Sumerians may have been of Turki or of Ugro-Altaic stock, but they were strongly Semitized. The Elamites are often regarded as of the Turki race, but we have little to guide us except the language.

<sup>2</sup> Haddon, *Wanderings of Peoples*, p. 27; *Races of Man*, p. 60.

<sup>3</sup> Of the Medes Herodotus says: ἐκαλέοντο δὲ πάλαι πρὸς πάντων Ἄριοι (Herod. vii, 62); and the Armenian historians continue to use the name. Cf. Rawlinson, Herod. i, p. 388.

<sup>4</sup> It is convenient to have a generic name for the whole group of the Indo-European languages; and usage has sanctioned the term Aryan. But the Āryas were only one of the numerous Scythic tribes who used an Aryan speech; and had nothing to do with its origin. There are older forms than either Sanskrit or Avestic. The steppe dwellers carried their

Varuna, Mitra, and the Nāsatyas were worshipped by Āryas alike on the banks of the Euphrates and the Ganges.<sup>1</sup>

But it is through ethnology that we can best determine their origin. These Āryas, it is true, have left us no skeletons by which to judge them, unless the earliest human remains found in Turkestan be theirs.<sup>2</sup> But just as we infer from the connexion between Avestic and Sanskrit that they both sprang from a common root, so the Āryas, despite the revolutions of centuries, survive in their descendants, and we know that they must have belonged to one common stock, resembling each other in face and figure, and possessed of the same physique.

The type has been largely adulterated both in Persia and in India with other elements—in Persia with Semites and Tajiks, and in India with Dravidians. But the Parsis about Persepolis and the Loris of the Zagros range are remarkably free from any infusion of extraneous blood; while in India we have the Indo-Aryan who has preserved the type with little alteration, despite the foreign invaders he has from time to time absorbed.

Between these Parsis, Loris, and Indo-Aryans there is a close resemblance. They are fair brunets—not blondes, for blue eyes and red hair are rare; their faces are oval, regular, and fine; their beards are abundant; their heads are long; and their figures slender and lithe. Now these are the distinctive traits of the Mediterranean race, to which ethnologists assign them.<sup>3</sup>

speech all over Europe, as well as Western Asia and India; but of how it arose, and where, we know nothing.

<sup>1</sup> JRAS. 1909, pp. 1106 ff., and 1911, pp. 42-6.

<sup>2</sup> Sergi assigns the skeletons found by Pumpelly at Anau to the *Homo Mediterraneus*, Pumpelly (*Prehistoric Civilisations of Anau*, ii).

<sup>3</sup> Ripley, *The Races of Europe*, pp. 448-51. "There can be no doubt of their racial affiliation with our Berbers, Greeks, Italians, and Spaniards. They are all members of the same race, at once the widest in its geographical extension, the most populous, and the most primitive of our three European types."

Their general resemblance to the peoples of Southern Europe and Northern Africa is unmistakable. Individuals of the one class can easily pass for individuals of the other.<sup>1</sup> And as far back as we can go, these were the traits of the ancient Āryas. Colour is the most obvious of racial characteristics, and the ancient Āryas were distinguished by their fairness from the dark-skinned peoples among whom they settled. The earliest Āryas we know of were white-skinned slaves from two petty districts in the Zagros range, exposed for sale in the markets of Babylon.<sup>2</sup> The Persians were fair; they are represented as fairer than the Macedonians on the so-called sarcophagus of Alexander. The Indian Āryas prided themselves on their fairness;<sup>3</sup> they were fair, the aborigines black and hideous. *Varna*, or colour, was the earliest word for the distinctions of caste. The Greeks compared the great mass of the Indians to the Ethiopians, i.e. Nubians and Negritos, so far as complexion was concerned;<sup>4</sup> but in the North, the Panjab, they were like the Egyptians.<sup>5</sup> Ctesias had seen both fair and dark Indians at the Persian Court.<sup>6</sup> With this fairness all the other marks of the Mediterranean man were combined. The Aryan features were regular and refined. The Indian Āryas spoke of the beautiful noses of their gods, and they

<sup>1</sup> It is sometimes difficult to distinguish in a photograph a British officer dressed in a Sikh uniform and turban from his native comrades.

<sup>2</sup> JRAS. 1909, p. 1113.

<sup>3</sup> They were fair, but not the fairest of the fair. In the R̥ig Veda, i, 100, 18, they are aided by "white-hued friends" against the Dasyu; i.e. they were brunets (Macdonell and Keith, *Vedic Glossary*, i, 356, n. 6).

<sup>4</sup> Their hair was not woolly, but straight; they were physically more robust, and their complexions not so dark (Strabo, II, iii, 7, p. 103; xv, 24, p. 696).

<sup>5</sup> Τῶν δ' ἀνθρώπων οἱ μὲν μεσημβρινοὶ τοῖς Αἰθίοψιν εἰσιν ὅμοιοι κατὰ τὴν χροιάν, κατὰ δὲ τὴν ὕψιν καὶ τὴν τρίχῳσιν τοῖς ἔλλοις (οὐδὲ γὰρ οὐλοτριχοῦσι διὰ τὴν ὑγρότητα τοῦ ἀέρος), οἱ δὲ βόρειοι τοῖς Αἰγυπτίοις (Strabo, xv, 13, p. 690).

<sup>6</sup> Ctesias, *Indica*, par. 9 (*Fragmenta Ctesiae Cnidii*, ed. Müller). He says: ὅτι οἱ Ἴνδοι οὐχ ὑπὸ τοῦ ἡλίου εἰσὶ μέλανες, ἀλλὰ φύσει, εἶναι γὰρ φησιν ἐν αὐτοῖς καὶ ἀνδρας καὶ γυναῖκας λευκοτάτους πάντων, εἰ καὶ ἐπ' ἔλαττον.

possessed in some degree what they admired. Their beards were abundant and they dyed them; they were slender and tall and their weight was light.<sup>1</sup>

This last remark, which I have borrowed from Nearchus, introduces a somewhat difficult problem. The Indo-Aryans are a tall race. The great majority of the Rājputs (86 p.c.) are 5 ft. 7 in. and upwards in height; nearly half of them are over 5 ft. 9 in.; even the poorest and worst-fed classes in the Panjab average 5 ft. 6 in.; and a Sikh regiment on parade will compare favourably with any regiment in Europe. We find the same in antiquity. Porus was over five cubits, Sophytes (Sopeithes) over four.<sup>2</sup> When Apollonius of Tyana came to India, he remarked that although the Indo-Afghans were tall, the Indians to the east of the Indus were taller. So says Philostratus. It was a commonplace with the Greek romance writers, and this characteristic tallness occurs among some of the Aryo-Dravidians, although not in such a marked degree.<sup>3</sup>

This peculiarity of stature is one which the Indo-Aryans share with the ancient Scyths. The Sacæ and other Scythic tribes whom Alexander fought were tall, taller than the Macedonians.<sup>4</sup> On the other hand, neither Medes nor Persians were noted for their height, although it is said that the Loris of the present day are tall. Stature, unlike the skull and the hair, is a very variable character. Whether the Medic and the Persian tribes

<sup>1</sup> For the Indian accounts v. Macdonell and Keith, *Vedic Index*, vol. i, pp. 347 and 356 ff., s.v. *Dasyu* and *dāsa*. For their beards and figure, Arriani *Indica*, c. 16 and 17. "The Indians are in person slender and tall, and of much lighter weight than other men" (MacCrindle's trans., c. 17).

<sup>2</sup> Arriani *Anabasis*, v, 19, 1; Diod. Sic., xvii, 91.

<sup>3</sup> I have already remarked that one-third of the Brahmans in the United Provinces are over 5 ft. 7 in.

<sup>4</sup> Q. Curtius, *de rebus gestis Alex. Mag.*, vii, 4, 6. "Quorum neminem adeo humilem esse ut humeri ejus non possent Macedonis militis verticem æquare."

were always shorter than their eastern brethren is a question which we cannot answer. The same causes which affected the Eastern Scyths may have affected the Indian Āryas in their Bactrian habitat. Whatever the explanation may be, they were a tall race before they entered India. In so far they differed from the later Medes and Persians.

From these Āryas, these long-headed Mediterranean men, let us turn to the second element in our history, the Dravidian aborigines.

When the Āryas entered India they found it already occupied, thinly occupied in the Panjab, but well peopled by Dravidian tribes possessing a considerable neolithic civilization of their own in the Middle Gangetic valley. These Dravidians were not the earliest settlers in the country, for small groups of Negritos from the west had wandered over it, pure savages who still survive in the most inaccessible jungles of Southern India.<sup>1</sup> But the Dravidians were the first to spread over the length and breadth of the land. They came so long ago that their racial affinities can no longer be traced. Some ethnologists connect them with the Australian blacks; others with the Ugro-Altaic races. Throughout the greater part of India they are intermixed with later immigrants from the west and north and east; but they can be traced by their physique, their social customs, and beliefs; and in the Tamulian kingdoms of Southern

<sup>1</sup> The Negrito element, dark-skinned with curly but not woolly hair, can be traced along the sea-coast of Southern Asia, and in regions not far from it, for a great distance. Negritos are found in the neighbourhood of Aden and along the southern coast of Arabia; they were probably the "Black-heads" of Babylonia; Houssay discovered traces of them in ancient Susiana; and they are found in the South of India and in the Malay Peninsula. The Veddas of Ceylon and the Toala of the Celebes belong to the same stock. To these many add the Melanesians and Australian blacks (Haddon, *Races of Man*, pp. 12-13). Cf. Thurston, *Castes and Tribes of Southern India*, i, Introduction, pp. xx-xxiii.

India a large section has preserved itself intact. Physically they are a fairly long-headed, dark-skinned race of medium stature; the nose is coarse and broad among the lower social strata, mesorhine among the upper ranks; the hair is black and straight; a patient, laborious, and mechanical folk, excellent artisans, delighting in details, and with some genius for religion and the plastic arts. In character they remind one of the ancient inhabitants of Sumer and Accad, the primitive peoples of Southern Babylonia.<sup>1</sup>

The Vindhya are the home of various jungle tribes which are found in their greatest purity in Chota Nagpur and the north-eastern districts of the Madras Presidency. They are the Nishādas of early Hindu literature, low of stature, short-limbed, and flat-nosed, with "fiery red eyes", and skins as black as a "charred brand". Although now confined to the Vindhya, they spread at one time over the greater part of the Middle Ganges valley and into Rajputana, and they have contributed a considerable element towards the menial population of Eastern Hindustan and Bihar. Physically they are not to be distinguished from the lower-class Dravidians; but they speak a language, the Mundāri, which is affiliated to a group of languages known as the Mōn-Khmēr, spoken by scattered bodies of savage or semi-savage men in Assam, Burmah, and the Malay Peninsula. For this reason some suppose that they represent another race, as ancient as the Dravidian, which preceded the Dravidian in occupying the lands of the Ganges. It may be so; but language forms an integral part of the history of culture rather than of race; tribes in a low stage of civilization change their language very readily. Suffice it to say that at the time of the Āryan invasion the aborigines of the Ganges valley seem to have been fairly homogeneous;

<sup>1</sup> Thurston has treated of the Dravidians very fully in his Introduction to *The Castes and Tribes of Southern India*, vol. i.

and the tribes were distinguished from each other by degrees of neolithic civilization, not by race.<sup>1</sup>

Northern India, the future home of the Āryas, extends in one vast alluvial plain from the Bay of Bengal to the Indus. The dreary uniformity of the landscape is broken only by the rivers. These rivers are numerous, and of a size and volume unknown elsewhere in the ancient world. They formed the chief physical obstacle to the advance of the Āryas, as they afterwards did to Alexander; and the passage of the greater streams was celebrated with hymns of praise.

These rivers divide Northern India into two unequal and dissimilar regions. The Āryas occupied the first, but only part of the second, that part of it which constitutes the valley of the Middle Ganges, extending from Sirhind and the Jumna to the eastern boundaries of Bihar. The Panjab proper, the land of the five streams, lies in the Indus basin, and forms the most important part of it. Now the Punjab is a narrow strip, 100 to 150 miles broad, between the Himalayas and the Rajputana desert. It is grazing country for the most part; there is little good arable soil except in the river valleys and in some submontane tracts, and it is not until we cross the Satlej and enter the Eastern Panjab that the soil improves. The rainfall is scanty, and under primitive conditions of life the population was necessarily very limited. Soon after leaving the Satlej we cross the watershed, and enter the Gangetic valley; and the eastern portion of the present political province, which extends to the Jumna, supports half the population, although it embraces only one-quarter of the area. The

<sup>1</sup> For these Mundā-speaking tribes v. *Census of India*, 1911, pp. 322-7; Sir G. Grierson, JRAS., 1907, pp. 187 ff. and 743; Haddon, *Races of Man*, p. 64. Cf. Thurston, op. cit., vol. i, p. xxiii. For the ease with which small tribes change their language v. Gait in *Census of India*, 1911, p. 328.



Greeks remarked how much more fertile the land became when one crossed the Hypanis (Biās).<sup>1</sup>

The Gangetic valley presents a totally different character. It is a great agricultural country, blessed with a fertile soil and an ample rainfall; it can produce two crops in the year, and at the present day it supports one of the densest rural populations in the world. The rivers are numerous and make communications easy; all the oldest towns are built upon a river bank. There are extensive grazing grounds, it is true, at the foot of the Himalayas, and down to a comparatively late period there was much forest and grass jungle in the interior. But the neighbourhood of the rivers was always well peopled. Thus the conditions of life are entirely different from those in the Panjab. The Panjab is in the main a grazing country, and pastoral tribes in a primitive stage of society require wide areas for their cattle; they have their summer and their winter pastures, and from time to time they change their quarters. The population in proportion to the area is limited; and there is little specialization of functions. In an agricultural country a much smaller area suffices for a much larger population; habitations are fixed; and specialization of function becomes a necessity. When a tribe passes from the pastoral and semi-nomadic stage to an agricultural mode of living, it undergoes an entire transformation.

The watershed between the Indus and the Ganges river-basin lies a little to the west of Delhi and to the east of Thānēsar; it passes through Sirhind, which is, as its name implies, the gate of Hindustan<sup>2</sup>; and it has always played a decisive part in Indian political history. Neither the Greeks nor the Scythic invaders of India,

<sup>1</sup> Strabo, xv, c. 37, p. 702. For the physical geography of the Panjab v. Ibbetson's *Outlines of Panjāb Ethnography*, pars. 6-24.

<sup>2</sup> This interpretation is modern; the word was originally *Sarhind*, but the modern version admirably connotes the fact.

the Sakas and Kushans and Huns, were ever able to establish themselves permanently to the east of this line. It formed the boundary of the empire of the Guptas in the early centuries of our era, and of the kingdom of Kanauj in the mediaeval period. The distinction between Hindustan and the Panjab has always made itself felt. Even at the present day the natural communications of the Panjab are with Bombay and the west of India; while the United Provinces have their main connexions with Bengal.

This watershed is the line of demarcation in race and speech between the Indo-Aryans and the Aryo-Dravidians at the present day. It was the same in the late Vedic and the Puranic age. And as it has played a decisive part in historic times, may we not recognize its influence at a still earlier stage? It is but reasonable to suppose that it was the decisive factor in the differentiation of Indo-Aryan and Aryo-Dravidian.<sup>1</sup> The aboriginal element in the Panjab at the outset must have been very small. This we infer from the fact that the aborigines were pure savages, in all probability like those about the delta of the Indus and in Rajputana, therefore few in number, and that the infusion of aboriginal blood among the Indo-Aryans is very slight. For similar reasons we infer exactly the converse regarding the Aryo-Dravidians of the Ganges valley. The Āryas advancing from a country which was nearly vacant found their farther progress barred by the increasing density of the aboriginal population; while that population possessed a considerable civilization and an importance of its own.<sup>2</sup>

<sup>1</sup> An almost imperceptible watershed is generally quite sufficient to separate one herd of black buck from another herd. They seldom cross it except when they are driven.

<sup>2</sup> Iyengar, *Age of the Mantras*, p. 15, says that when the Āryas reached India "the country was not a barren waste, but its rich valleys were filled with a teeming population, speaking dialects of the Dravidian and Mundā languages. They were not primitive tribes, but tilled the ground, and raised crops of various kinds . . . they

This is what we might expect from the physical difference between the Indus and the Ganges basins; and it is what actually happened. The difference between the two river systems is the master-key to the history of the Indian Āryas.

## II

Our earliest historical notice of the great Aryan migration dates from c. B.C. 1800, when a white-skinned race made its appearance in the Zagros range. The Indian Āryas living farthest to the east, and in Bactria, the most fertile part of Turkestan, were presumably the last to move; they probably did not begin their march until after B.C. 1700; B.C. 1600 is the date more commonly assigned. Indian chronology commences with the preaching of the Buddha and the annexation of the Panjab by Darius Hystaspes in the sixth century B.C. During the thousand uncharted years or more which elapsed between the Aryan invasion and the mission of the Buddha, the Aryanization of Northern India was accomplished, the Aryanization which is the subject of our history.

For the first part of this period down to about 1000 B.C. we have the guidance of the Rig Veda. None of these Vedic hymns go back to the beginning of things. None of them, for instance, treats at length of the passage of the Indus, which must have been the most difficult of all the feats accomplished by the first-comers. For the second part of our history we have to rely on the references, incidental and rare, in later literature. This twofold division of our authorities corresponds roughly with the twofold division of our history. The first part deals with the movements and settlements of the Āryas;

worked in metals . . . they traded with foreign countries". But Iyengar confounds times early and late. Macdonell and Keith, *Vedic Index*, i, p. 358, say more truly: "The wealth of the Dāsas was no doubt considerable, but in civilization there is no reason to suppose that they were ever equal to the invaders."

the latest of which was probably not later than B.C. 900. The second part deals with the Aryanization of the country south of them by an interpenetration which was for the most part peaceful.<sup>1</sup>

There were three stages in the Aryan advance. We find the Āryas at the outset in occupation of the valley of the Kabul River, and the north-east angle of the Panjab as far as the Satlej.<sup>2</sup> The Jumna and the Ganges are unknown, or known only by rumour. After a time they push eastward, encamp on either bank of the Saraswati, the last of the Panjab Rivers, and gradually take possession of the head of the Gangetic Doab. So much we learn from the hymns of the R̥ig Veda, but these hymns end before the occupation of the Kuru-Pañchāla country was complete. A little later Aryan tribes, continuing their eastward road, established the two petty kingdoms of Kōsala and Vidēha on either side the Gandak. The Panjab, the Kuru-Pañchāla country, and Kōsala-Vidēha were the three Aryan settlements; and from these three all Northern India was Aryanized.

The R̥ig Veda furnishes us with only scanty notices of these wanderings; but it gives us instead a vivid picture of the Indian Āryas and their mode of life.<sup>3</sup> They were, a primitive people, living in villages of mud and wood, and with a sufficient knowledge of agriculture to grow barley. Above all things they were herdsmen whose wealth consisted in their cattle, and who required wide pastures for their support. The country which they occupied was a pastoral country, broken by ravines between the Indus and the Salt Range, but elsewhere open grazing land. The Āryas had brought the Turkoman horse, which they yoked and sometimes rode.

<sup>1</sup> My chief authorities for this chapter are Macdonell and Keith's *Vedic Index*; Srinivas Iyengar, *Life in Ancient India*; and R. Chanda, *The Indo-Aryan Race*.

<sup>2</sup> Hopkins, *Religions of India*, p. 30.

<sup>3</sup> *Ibid.*, c. 2; and P. T. Srinivas Iyengar, *Life in Ancient India*.

The kings went to war in chariots, and their charioteers were as important as Patrokles to Achilles. But when the tribe moved—and it did so frequently—the people took their wives and children with them in ox-drawn wagons. There was little division of labour, and certain artisans, like the chariot-builders, were much esteemed. The Brahmans, being the bards and medicine men of the community, formed a hereditary class, somewhat apart from the others. They depended chiefly on the bounty of the king and the nobles whose sacrifices they directed.

In material civilization the Āryas differed little from others in the same primitive stage. They were acquainted with gold and copper, but not with iron or bronze.<sup>1</sup> We have no specimens of their pottery; it was probably as rude as that of the Western Āryas. Stone being unprocurable, their implements must have been of wood and bone, and they ploughed with wooden ploughs. They differed little from other peoples living in the æneolithic stage.

Nor did they possess any special genius for religion. Their sacred hymns, although often poetical, are essentially mundane—prayers for cattle and for wealth, for fixed habitations, and deliverance from their enemies.<sup>2</sup> They have little of the deep earnestness and religious feeling which find expression in the much earlier Babylonian hymns. The instincts which led to the creation of the Hindu theocracy, and the marvellous aptitude for religious

<sup>1</sup> There is no tin in India, and the swords and other implements found in the Ganges Valley are of copper. V. Smith, I.A. xxxiv, 1905, pp. 229 ff. Dr. Smith says: "This essay will be primarily devoted to proving that in the greater part of Northern India a copper age intervened between the neolithic and the iron age; and secondarily, to proving that India had no bronze age." Cf. Macdonell and Keith, *Vedic Index*, s.v. *loha*; ii, p. 234.

<sup>2</sup> Varuna is the only one of the Vedic gods who bears a really ethical character; he flees from sin, and punishes sinners. But this side of his character is a comparatively late development (*v.* Hopkins, *op. cit.*, pp. 61 ff.).

speculation which the Brahmans subsequently displayed, were no part of the original endowment of the Āryas; they must be otherwise explained.

The superiority of the Āryas consisted neither in their mechanical aptitudes, or love of art, or genius for religion, but in their social structure. The constitution of society was patriarchal, and the unit of the tribe was the joint family. Every family was a world of its own; it had its own traditions and its own worship which centred in the worship of the ancestors and of the fire of the hearth. The joint family embraced several generations; every member was born equal; nor was the head a despot like the Roman *pater familias*, but the offerer of the sacrifice and the guide and executor of the family council. The joint family was the special mark of the Aryan policy, which distinguished it from every other; and it is still the test by which to judge how far the Aryanization of any section of Hindu society has proceeded.

Of such families the tribe was composed. Whether all the tribes had kings is perhaps doubtful. When the Greeks came, they found the greatest clans and the most warlike were "kingless". And in the Far East the Buddhist traditions say the same thing of Kōsala and Vidēha.<sup>1</sup> These "kingless" clans were oligarchies ruled by the most powerful families. But in the R̥ig Veda all the clans were led by kings. With the king were the nobles, the *Rājanya*. Kings and nobles led the tribesmen in war, and all the able-bodied members of the community, whether herdsmen or Brahmans, took part in the battle.

For these tribes were frequently at war. They had two classes of enemies. There were hostile tribes of Āryas, and there were the aborigines. The Āryas raided each other's cattle; and they fought for pasture lands. Their chief wars were with each other. The aborigines

<sup>1</sup> The Kathaians, Malli, Sibi, Oxydrakæ were all "kingless". For Kōsala-Vidēha v. Rhys Davids, *Buddhist India*, pp. 17 ff.

of the Panjab were numerically few: Nagas, hillmen from the jungles and foothills of the Himalayas, and Dravidian hunters and fishers of the plains, pure savages like the Bhils, or such as Herodotus describes on the lower Indus. The Āryas looked on these *Dasyus*, as they called them, with contempt and fear; much as the Pilgrim Fathers regarded the Redskins that lurked in the backwoods near their farms. Small bands of these savages would surprise the Aryan villages and encampments by night as well as by day; and their women fought as well as the men. But it was not so much the arrows of the savages which the Āryas dreaded as their witchcraft. Witchcraft is the resource of the degraded; they are feared if they are despised; and the malign powers of the dark and stunted dwellers in the fever-stricken Terai are still an article of faith and of dread among their Hindu neighbours.

The tribes were numerous. Ten kings went forth to fight Sudās, each at the head of his clan, and they were joined by seven or eight allies. The R̥ig Veda mentions a large number of tribes by name, but not all of these seem to have been Aryan, and many must have been very small.<sup>1</sup> Moreover, the R̥ig Veda represents a time when the Āryas had multiplied greatly. The immigrants from Bactria had come at intervals through a long succession of years, so that many dialects were spoken, and the speech of one tribe was scarcely intelligible to another. They had their own tribal divinities, although certain great gods were common to them all.<sup>2</sup> And they were semi-nomadic, moving from one pasture to another, as the

<sup>1</sup> Macdonell and Keith's *Vedic Index* gives the names of nearly seventy tribes which are mentioned in Vedic literature. Iyengar, op. cit., p. 8, says the "Mantras" mention about forty.

<sup>2</sup> Thus the Bharatas had their own Agni, and a special Τύχην in a goddess Bhārati. Agni bore different names among the Eastern and the Western Āryas. Cf. Iyengar, op. cit., p. 127; Macdonell and Keith, op. cit., ii, 97.

Panjab tribes always have done. Perhaps the most surprising thing about these Āryas is their numbers. We are so accustomed to large figures that we scarcely realize how small the numbers of mankind have usually been. We learn with surprise that there were only some four millions in England in the time of Queen Anne. Judæa, Greece, and Rome were all small states. It has been calculated that all Gaul may have had a population of nearly two millions when Julius Cæsar conquered it. But the Scyths of Central Asia supply us with the nearest analogy to these Indian Āryas. In the middle of the first century B.C. the Chinese made a careful estimate of the tribes dwelling in Western Turkestan; and the largest of them did not exceed 700,000 or 800,000 souls. The Indian Āryas may have numbered three-quarters of a million. It is doubtful whether the Panjab proper under the conditions of neolithic life could have supported more.

According to a passage in the Rîg Veda, the meaning of which is disputed, the Āryas were divided into five great tribal groups.<sup>1</sup> The number is perhaps conventional, and there is no agreement as to which five tribes are meant. The Turvasas came to the aid of the Pañchālas on one occasion six thousand strong.<sup>2</sup> If this represented the greater part of their fighting force, the tribe may have numbered thirty thousand souls. The Turvasas were one of the largest tribes; most of the tribes must have been much smaller.

Such, then, were the Āryas while they spread over the Panjab. During these three or four hundred years they have no history; nor is it easy for a pastoral people to have one. Generation after generation repeats what its

<sup>1</sup> Macdonell and Keith, *Vedic Index*, i, pp. 466 ff., s.v. *Pancajanāh* (Hopkins, op. cit., p. 26). The five peoples are sometimes said to be the Anus, Druhyus, Yadus, Turvasas, and Pūrus.

<sup>2</sup> But the meaning is obscure. The Turvasas appear later to have been merged in the Pañchālas (ibid., i, p. 116).



predecessor had done. There are the vicissitudes of the seasons, the hail and the drought, the winter's frosts, and summer heats, the visitations of pestilence and famine, the petty skirmishes with one's neighbours. But the monotony of the years lies upon them, and progress there is none. /Aryan history commences when the Āryas crossed from the Indus to the Ganges basin.

The R̥ig Veda only gives us a part of this history. It begins with the encampment of Āryas on the Sarasvatī. The Sarasvatī is the easternmost of all the Panjab rivers, and the one nearest to the Gangetic watershed. It was at one time an affluent of the Indus, and a considerable stream; but it has shrunk so that its bed is merely a succession of pools, full only in the rains, and it no longer reaches the Indus, but loses itself in the sands of Bikanir. Such as it is, it became one of the most sacred of streams. The R̥ishis had lived on its banks. It had marked at the outset the limits of the Aryan advance eastwards; and it became the western boundary of the holy land of the Brahmans, and of Āryāvarta, the country of the true Āryas, in contradistinction to the Āryas they had left behind them in the Panjab. The Pūrus were among the first of the tribes to establish themselves on its banks; and here they began to encounter the aborigines in considerable numbers—aborigines moreover who were not much inferior to themselves in neolithic culture, and who were a sedentary and agricultural people.<sup>1</sup> The Pūrus, being among the first-comers, were famed above the other Aryan tribes for their fights with the Dasyus. The most renowned of their kings bore the title of Trasadasyu, conqueror of the Dasyus. The Bharatas, famous above all the other Aryan clans, then enter on the scene. They were late-comers who had fought their way from the Indus across

<sup>1</sup> For the civilization of the aborigines v. Iyengar, op. cit., p. 13, and *Vedic Index*, i, 356, s.v. *Dāsa*.

the Panjab, and encamped on the Sarasvatī. They waged wars with all around them, with the Pūrus on the Sarasvatī, with Bheda on the Jumna, with the Turvasas from the west. With these Bharatas were associated various minor clans, such as the Sṛiñjayas, and the priestly white-clad sept of the Tritsus.<sup>1</sup> The R̥g Veda refers in various hymns to the exploits of the Bharata king Sudās, as well as of his father. Ten kings from the west banded themselves against him, but he overthrew them with great slaughter. The kings of the Anu and the Druhyu were drowned as they fled; the Turvasa and Yadu kings escaped. In the end the Bharatas crossed the Sarasvatī, and established themselves in the country which is now Sirhind. At a still later date after the compilation of the R̥g Veda, the Bharatas moved again; and the Kurus took possession of the country, which henceforth acquired the name of Kurukshētra.<sup>2</sup>

An accident has preserved for us the memory of Sudās and his wars. Other wars there must have been, and the aborigines were all brought peacefully or forcibly under subjection. But the whole scene changes. The increasing density of population impedes the eastward progress of the Āryas. It is only by slow degrees that they spread over the head of the Gangetic Doab. Tribes pressing onwards from the west find their advance is blocked. They crowd upon each other, and begin to coalesce. The Bharatas intermarry with their former enemies the Pūrus. They are joined by their ancient enemies the Turvasas, while the Sṛiñjayas were associated with the Bharatas from the outset. Small bodies of other tribes, such as the Yadus, swell their numbers. In this

<sup>1</sup> For the Tritsus v. Macdonell and Keith, *Vedic Index*, i, pp. 320-3.

<sup>2</sup> For the Bharatas, Turvasas, Pūrus, etc., v. Macdonell and Keith, *Vedic Index*, i, pp. 315 ff.; ii, pp. 11-13, 94-7. The exploits of Sudās and his father Divōdasa are narrated in the iii, vi, and vii Maṇḍalas of the R̥g Veda. For the Kurus v. op. cit., i, pp. 165-9.

way a coalition of the tribes takes place. They gradually occupy the whole of the head of the Gangetic Doab and overflow into Rohilkhand; and the country is henceforth the country of the Pañchālas. The tribal kings disappear and we hear no more of the separate clans. Bharatas, Turvasas, Krivis, Pūrus are no longer distinguished from each other; tribal ties fall into desuetude; and as the tribes not only intermarry with each other, but take the women of the aborigines for their concubines, a great intermixture of blood takes place. The whole process is carried out under the leadership of the Bharatas; and it results in a unified state in which the Āryas are lords, the aborigines are subjects, and the Bharata king is the supreme master.<sup>1</sup>

The Rīg Veda was canonically closed before this evolution was complete. Two subsequent movements of importance took place. Instead of a Bharata we find a Kuru king at the head of the Pañchālas. He claims descent from the Bharata kings, and from the Pūru hero Trasadasyu, while the Kurus take possession of the land east of the Sarasvatī which the Bharatas had left. The Rīg Veda knows the name of Kuru, but nothing of a Kuru tribe, and an uncertain tradition connects the Kurus with a small and insignificant tribe, the Krivis, dwelling by the Indus. The Bharatas continued to be the strongest of all the confederate tribes and we do not know how the Kurus took the lead; but the Kuru king is the hero of the epic tradition, and the country was henceforth known as the country of the Kuru-Pañchālas.<sup>2</sup>

Another movement of these Āryas took place soon after the close of the Rīg Veda period, while the migratory impulse was still fresh, and before the consolidation of the Pañchālas was complete. Certain pastoral tribes which still preserved their tribal constitution pursued

<sup>1</sup> Macdonell and Keith, *Vedic Index*, i, p. 468, s.v. *Pañcāla*.

<sup>2</sup> *Ibid.*, i, pp. 165-9; ii, pp. 125-6.

their eastern way along the rich grazing grounds at the foot of the Himalayas, and crossing the Gandak with difficulty, established new seats in North-East Oudh and North Bihar, where they formed the two states of Kōsala and Vidēha, petty states destined to become famous in history as the birthplace of the Buddhists and the Jains.<sup>1</sup>

With this the migrations of the Āryas came to an end, and the second period of our history begins. Northern and Central Rajputana was colonized from the Panjab, the Gangetic Doab Aryanized by the Kuru-Pañchalas, and Oudh and Bihar from Kōsala and Vidēha. This Aryanization was completed in all its main outlines before the sixth century B.C. The three processes were quite distinct, and I proceed to treat of each in turn.

A. Rajputana forms no part of the alluvial plain of Northern India. It consists of a plateau projecting from the Vindhya; and the Aravallis, a range of immense antiquity, intersect it diagonally from south-west to north-east, and divide it into two unequal halves. The northern half, which was first colonized from the Panjab, has the greater area. The soil is poor, the air is dry, the rainfall small; and a desert of hard gravel and wind-driven sandhills intervenes between it and the last traces of scanty vegetation in the Panjab. But this desert is by no means impassable. It is covered in the spring with a prickly vegetation which the camels love; there are oases in the waste and towns in the wilderness; and the caravan routes across it occupy a considerable place in Ptolemy's geography. The Mārwarīs are still among the merchant princes of India.

The south-eastern angle of the plateau beyond the Aravallis is somewhat different. It is at a higher level, and crossed by various broken ridges running parallel with the Aravallis; there are numerous sporadic hills

<sup>1</sup> For Kōsala-Vidēha v. Rhys Davids, *Buddhist India*, pp. 25 ff., and Macdonell and Keith, *Vedic Index*, i, pp. 153-5; ii, pp. 298 ff.

which were capped in much later days by famous Rājput fortresses ; and fertile tracts alternate with tracts of gravel or sand.

Bhils and Mīnas were the first to wander over the face of this country. They spread at one time much farther afield, and were to be found, even in the early middle ages, in parts of the Doab and Rohilkhand. They are savages who live mainly by hunting and on the jungle produce ; and wander within their appointed limits, each little clan distinguished by its totem. In the bardic chronicles of Rājputana they figure as the allies and the jackals of the Rājputs ; they despise Brahmans and kill cows ; and their claim as autochthons to the nominal lordship of the soil is universally acknowledged.

Rājputana, therefore, was an empty land, open to all comers. The eastern portion of Rājputana between the Aravallis and the Jumna was first occupied, and that contemporaneously with the occupation of the Kuru-Pañchāla country. The Matsyas settled in Alwar, the Yādavas or Sūrasēnas in Mathurā, and the Vatsas in Bundelkhand. All these tribes were closely connected with the Gangetic Doab, and under Brahman influence, although perhaps less mixed in blood, since the aboriginal population was small. But the larger area outside the Aravallis must have been colonized from the Panjab, although the process was much slower, and all details are wanting. Down to the seventh and eighth centuries A.D. this country had no political importance, and seems to have been very thinly occupied. Ptolemy knows of the caravan routes across it, of wild tribes, such as the Phylitæ (Bhils ?) about the Aravallis, but the only Aryan or semi-Aryan tribe he mentions are the Chatriaiōi, and he knows of no towns. The Mahābhārata substitutes the Sālvas, a tribe allied to the Matsyās, for the Chatriaiōi ; beyond them were Śūdras and Abhīras. It puts Mālavas in the neighbourhood of the Aravallis. In historical times

tribes from the Panjab have repeatedly crossed the desert in search of new habitations; and in this way the Malli and the Kathaioi, famous in Alexander's campaign, have given their names to Malwa and Kathiawar. And we judge that what happened in historic times happened in prehistoric. But the greater part of Rajputana was a backward country until the Gujars (Gurjaras) and other Scythic tribes poured into it, and mixing with the earlier settlers, gave form and fashion to the Rājput clans, whose history and ideals have made Rajputana ever since illustrious.

The earliest colonization of the greater part of Rajputana was the unrecorded work of the Indo-Aryans. But there were two movements of Aryanization in the Indus valley, with which they had apparently not much to do. Gandhāra lies on either side of the Indus where it issues from the hills; and according to the Purāṇas it was inhabited by the Druhyus and cognate tribes, the ancestors of the Indo-Afghans. The R̥ig Veda barely mentions it, and the Achæmenids and the Chinese expressly distinguish it from India proper. But at some unknown time a colony of Brahmans settled there, and made it a centre of literary studies. The Aryo-Dravidian Brahmans acknowledged its pre-eminence and the purity of its speech; students from the Gangetic Doab resorted to it; and Pāṇini, the first and greatest of Hindu grammarians, taught there. With the Aryo-Dravidian learning the Brahmans introduced Aryo-Dravidian ideals of purity and of caste. When the Macedonians invaded India, they found five small kingdoms among the foothills of the Himalayas and in the angle between the Indus and the Salt Range. The hill country of Abhisāra, Taxila on the border of the foothills, the kingdoms of Porus and his nephew, and of Sophytes were ruled by kings; and the laws of these countries were said to be good.<sup>1</sup> In

<sup>1</sup> Strabo, xv, c. 28, p. 698.

other words Brahman ordinances were enforced. Outside this enclave were the great Panjab tribes, the Malli, the Kathaians, the Oxydrakæ, and the Sibi; and they were "kingless". Brahmans were their counsellors, but the laws of caste were very laxly observed, and the Gangetic Brahmans regarded them as Kshatriyas who had fallen from their high estate and were little better than Śūdras.<sup>1</sup> We shall see hereafter that tribal organization and caste are incompatible in the long run. These great tribes retained their tribal organization and the martial spirit as well as the physique of the primitive Āryas; and these characteristics they have retained to the present day. The learned orthodoxy of the Brahmans of Gandhāra never took any hold of them.

Neither the Rīg Veda nor the later Epic and Puranic literatures make mention of Sind and the valley of the lower Indus. Darius Hystaspes secured the navigation of the Indus, but he made no attempt to annex the country below Multan; he evidently considered it not worth the trouble. Herodotus knows only of pure savages dwelling here. There were tribes living in the marshes who used bamboo canoes and ate fish raw; others lived on the jungle produce; the Padaioi were eaters of raw flesh; and the Kalatiai put their aged relatives to death.<sup>2</sup> Ctesias had seen some of these savages at the court of Artaxerxes. Later Greeks remarked on the darkness of their skins; and the description Herodotus gives of the Eastern Ethiopians tallies exactly with the description of the Dravidians given by the Greeks. They were black, black as the Nubians, only their hair was straight and not woolly. The aborigines of the Indus delta differed little, if at all, from these Eastern

<sup>1</sup> Macdonell and Keith, *Vedic Index*, ii, 126; *Laws of Manu* (SBE, xxv), x, 44. Manu, however, has chiefly foreigners in view—Yavanas, Pahlavas, Śakas, etc. The Mahābhārata calls the tribes on the Indus *Mlechhas* or barbarians.

<sup>2</sup> Herod. iii, 98-101.

Ethiopians. Both were Dravidians apparently ; and philologists have discovered traces of a Dravidian tongue in the speech of the Iranian Brahuīs.

These aborigines must have come under Aryan influence in the interval between the time of Darius Hystaspes and Alexander. The historians of Alexander's campaign show us a powerful Brahman aristocracy ruling over low-caste Śūdras ; and the subjects of Musikanos, although they were not slaves, were helots.<sup>1</sup>

A third movement took place in the Panjab, of which we know even less than of the other two. The Druhyu and the Anu are among the most powerful of the Aryan tribes mentioned in the R̥ig Veda. The Druhyu dwelt on the Afghan border, and with them were various smaller tribes, one of which, the Pakhta, is identical with Herodotus' Paktyes (πάκτυες).<sup>2</sup> In early times the Druhyu roamed equally with the Anu over the Panjab, but they ultimately retired beyond the Indus, leaving a memorial of themselves in the Paisāchi language, traces of which are found in Kashmiri and Panjabi.

B. From the semi-orthodox Indo-Aryans of the Panjab we pass to the Aryo-Dravidian world of Brahman purity and caste. In later literature the centre of this world was known as "the middle country", Madhyadēśa. Madhyadēśa embraced the whole of the Gangetic Doab from the Himalayas to the confluence of the Ganges and the Jumna together with the lands to the west of the Jumna. Its western boundary was the Sarasvatī ; and it included the Matsyas of Alwar, who were closely connected with the Kuru-Pañchālas, the Vasas or Vatsas of Bundelkhand, and Avanti (Malwa) with its capital of Ujjayinī, a name famous in the history of Indian learning, and the chief intermediary between India and the Roman Empire. The northern portion of Madhyadēśa was the

<sup>1</sup> Strabo, xv, 54, p. 710.

<sup>2</sup> Herod. iii, 102.



real Brahman country; it included Brahmāvarta, Kurukshētra, and the Pañchālas, as well as the Matsyas of Alwar and the Surasēnas of Mathurā.<sup>1</sup>

We have seen that the original Aryan settlements were in the Kuru-Pañchāla country. It was there that the Aryan tribes coalesced, intermarried, and were united under a single king; and from this land they went forth to subdue the rest of the Doab. But by the sixth century B.C. we find that all political power has passed from the north to the south. The chief kingdoms are now Kōsambī on the Jumna, the capital of the Vasas, a few miles above the confluence of the Jumna with the Ganges, Mathurā, the Śūrasēna capital, also on the Jumna, and Avantī with its capital Ujjayini. The kings of Avantī were related by blood to the Śūrasēnas, and allied by marriage with the Vasas.<sup>2</sup> We have therefore a double problem to solve—the Aryanization of the Southern Doab from the Kuru-Pañchāla country, and the subsequent transfer of political power from the purer Āryas of the north to the more mixed Aryan communities in the south.

Late Vedic literature supplies some hints regarding the Aryanization of the country. It was partly the work of missionaries,<sup>3</sup> and partly of military adventurers. Holy men, Christian, Moslem, and Hindu, hermits popularly accredited with supernatural powers, have played a considerable part in the propagation of a higher faith and civilization; and they are the chief agents in the spread of Hinduism at the present day. Their influence was probably great. But the large infusion of Aryan blood among the Aryo-Dravidians of this region requires us to assume a much more general movement.

<sup>1</sup> Macdonell and Keith, *Vedic Index*, ii, 125-6. The country of the Kuru-Pañchālas is the country "where the Brāhmanas and the later Samhitās were produced". Cf. *ibid.*, i, 154, 468.

<sup>2</sup> Rhys Davids, *Buddhist India*, p. 3.

<sup>3</sup> Macdonell and Keith, *Vedic Index*, i, 168.

The Bharatas were the leading tribe among the Kuru-Pañchālas—they were doubtless the chief adventurers, and one tradition makes them raid down the Ganges to Kāśī (Benares).<sup>1</sup> The Bharatas afterwards drop out; they were merged in, or identified with, the Kuru-Pañchālas; and another text describes the Doab as occupied by the Kuru-Pañchālas, the Vasas, and the Usīnaras.<sup>2</sup> We have found the Vasas at Kōsambī, but the Usīnaras disappear from history.

The considerable emigration southwards from the Kuru-Pañchāla country must have greatly weakened the political power of that petty kingdom. The story of its downfall is the subject of the great epic. This colossal epic which overflows all its banks, and serves for the Indians what the siege of Troy was for the Greeks, narrates the downfall of the Kurus at the hands of their kinsmen, the Pāṇḍavas. It represents the revolt of Southern Madhyadēśa and of the Pañchālas against the Kurus,<sup>3</sup> and the Puranic traditions confirm this reading. The Purāṇas were written at a time when all recollection of the migrations recorded in the Rīg Veda had been lost; and the traditions they record are those of the Southern Doab. They represent the Āryas as starting from Prayāga (Allahabad), and extending northwards, founding one famous city after another, and ending with the overthrow of Hastināpura, the Kuru capital. The result is certain; all political power passed from the north to the south of the Doab, and the country of the Kuru-Pañchālas never again regained any political importance. But it remained the centre of Brahman influence; Buddhism never took any hold of it; and the greater part of the Vedic literature, whether early or late, is the product of the Kuru-Pañchāla Brahman schools.<sup>4</sup>

<sup>1</sup> Ibid., i, 153-5, s.v. *Kāśī*.

<sup>2</sup> Ibid., i, 165-9; ii, 94-7, 273.

<sup>3</sup> Pargiter, JRAS., 1908, 334.

<sup>4</sup> Macdonell and Keith, *Vedic Index*, ii, 126.

C. Kōsala and Vidēha mark the farthest advance of the Āryas to the east. The Āryas who settled there retained their tribal constitution, and much of their Aryan traditions; they were governed by their nobles, who were Kshatriyas; and these Kshatriyas were not only chiefs in administration and war, but were devoted, some of them, to philosophy. Caste had not yet obliterated all traces of the original Aryan constitution, and the pre-eminence of the Brahmans was unrecognized.<sup>1</sup>

In the sixth century B.C. and down to Alexander's time two considerable states, Kōsala and Magadha, divided Eastern Oudh and Southern Bihar between them. At the present day the population of this country is the densest in India, and it was probably so in antiquity. The Āryas were comparatively few, much fewer than farther west, and the Dravidian element was strong. The kings of Magadha were frankly acknowledged to be Śūdras, and the Brahmans of Magadha were in low esteem.<sup>2</sup> But these Śūdra kings freely intermarried with the noble families of Kōsala, and the Aryanization of these lands must have been mainly due to intermarriages and to missionary propaganda.

In these eastern states the relation of the Āryas to the Dravidians was of a totally different character from that of the Āryas in Madhyadeśa. The Gangetic Doab never possessed any great political importance until the Guptas transferred their capital to Kanauj in the fourth century A.D. It was a Brahman land, the home of literature and learning, and of Vedic study, the birthplace of caste and Brahman ordinances.

But in Eastern Oudh and Bihar Dravidians and Āryas were on much more equal terms, and the Dravidian element was full of vitality. Rāma and Sītā are the

<sup>1</sup> Ibid., i, 153-5; ii, 116-8, 298; Rhys Davids, *Buddhist India*, pp. 60 ff.

<sup>2</sup> Macdonell and Keith, *Vedic Index*, i, 154-5.

tutelary gods of Eastern Oudh and Champaran, and military adventurers from Ayōdhyā, the Kōsala capital, carrying the ensigns of their gods, were probably the first to explore Southern India and to reach Ceylon.<sup>1</sup> From Oudh and Bihar the Mauryas and Guptas extended their empire over the greater part of Northern India; these states, although the least Aryan, were also the greatest. The Āryas possessed a learning and a spiritual superiority which was the admiration of the Dravidians, but the Āryas were not lords of the land. Under these conditions Aryan exclusiveness necessarily gave way. The Āryas began to adopt many Dravidian ways and beliefs, and they admitted the right of the Dravidians to share in their privileges. Now these privileges were largely religious. If the Dravidians were still prohibited from sharing in the Vedic rites which were racial and tribal, they could share in that larger and truer conception of a universal religion which the spirit of the times called for. In this way Buddhism and Jainism, the two great heresies, came into being. Buddha and Mahāvīra taught the equality of all men who put on the yellow robe, or followed the rôle of the ascetic. They prepared the way for that Neo-Hinduism which obliterated all racial barriers, and fused all discordant elements in a new community.

We have now completed our survey of the three stages in the settlements of the Āryas. Each of these stages was governed by different conditions, and the differences which manifested themselves at the outset were permanent; they endure to the present day. The pastoral and semi-nomadic Āryas took possession of the Panjab

<sup>1</sup> This appears to me the most probable explanation of the historical germ of the Rāmāyaṇa; but everyone is at liberty to frame his own theory. The identification of Lankā with Ceylon is late, and possibly due to the Buddhists. In the original poem, says Jacobi, Lankā was not an island but a town, and the Indian astronomers placed it on the equator, where it was intersected by the meridian of Ujjayini.

with little opposition, and in process of time colonized Northern and Central Rajputana. The only aborigines they had to do with were savages, and they retained unaltered their tribal constitution and their martial spirit.

In the valley of the Middle Ganges the aborigines were little inferior to the Āryas in material civilization, and in numbers too numerous to exterminate or to expel. The further one travelled down the stream, the denser became the population and the higher the civilization. The eastward advance of the Āryas was blocked; they made themselves masters of the Kuru-Pañchāla country; following in each other's wake the tribes gradually coalesced and intermarried, until they formed a single community under a sole king. Being exogamous, they took to themselves the women of the subject aborigines and became mixed in blood, and from being herdsmen they became agriculturists. Military adventurers and missionaries Aryanized the rest of the Doab, until the sceptre passed from the Kurus to the more virile Aryo-Dravidian states further down the Ganges.

In Eastern Oudh and Bihar the Āryas were fewer, the Dravidians stronger. The intellectual and religious superiority of the Āryas was admitted, but in other matters the Dravidians were their equals. The relations between Āryas and Dravidians were friendly, and resulted in the development of creeds which abolished, in part at least, all distinctions of race. On the other hand the whole process of Aryanization was much slower here than elsewhere. It was not complete until the Middle Ages were about to end.

The fusion of the Āryas with the aborigines led to a considerable advance in material civilization. Petty states took the place of loose tribal confederacies; Āryas and Śūdras made common cause against their neighbours; and the Śūdras were not forgotten when prayers were made for the Āryas; prayers were offered up for their

joint prosperity. The capitals of these states developed from villages into cities, and with this concentration of the population agriculture was extended, and trade flourished. Caravans of merchants, armed and able to protect themselves, traversed the country. The traders embraced every class, from the Brahman to the Śūdra; and the people of Magadha in especial seem to have been famous traders. Indeed, much of the trade appears to have been in Dravidian hands. The Arabs coasting along the desolate shores of the Arabian Gulf in search of wealth introduced a knowledge of letters among the peoples of the western seaboard; and from them this knowledge penetrated to Hindustan. An Indian alphabet was evolved, probably about the ninth or eighth century B.C., although writing for a long time was employed chiefly for secular and commercial purposes. About the same time Indians seem to have learnt the manufacture and use of iron. Whether this knowledge came to them by sea or through Central Asia it is hard to say. Probably from Central Asia.

This whole process of Aryanization had been elaborated in its fundamental outlines before the sixth century B.C. But one must beware of thinking that the whole of the Middle Ganges valley was by that time Aryanized. The Aryo-Dravidian settlements were the centres of the new polity, and they were for the most part on the banks of the great rivers. Much of the interior was covered by forest and grass jungle, and was occupied by the wilder aborigines. A great forest extended from Mathurā to the Vindhya; south of the Ganges from Rewa to Bihar was the region of the forest kings; a *dhāk* jungle, which can still be traced, divided the Doab; it gave shelter to the armies assembling for the Great War, and in Moghul days it was a famous haunt of robbers and cut-throats. A belt of forest and grass jungle stretches along the whole length of the Himalayan foothills; great forests

stretched into Oudh, and there was much jungle between Buddha's birthplace and Benares. This condition of things lasted in some places down to the end of the eighteenth century A.D.

These jungles and the waste lands of the interior were occupied by the wilder aborigines. In the early Middle Ages, when the kingdom of Kanauj was falling into decay, Bhars and Cheros and Doms and other aboriginal tribes built forts and set up petty kingdoms of their own. In antiquity they appear to have generally admitted the suzerainty of their more civilized neighbours. Megasthenes mentions a nomadic caste of herdsmen and shepherds who received grain from the king; and Pliny mentions the elephant-hunters as a special half-wild class.<sup>1</sup> A work ascribed to Chandra Gupta's prime minister requires the cultivating villages to be surrounded by a protective belt of forest and waste, a fashion which prevailed throughout Northern and Eastern Oudh down to the commencement of the nineteenth century.<sup>1</sup>

Before proceeding further I ought to notice another theory regarding the origin of the Aryo-Dravidians which has received a sort of semi-official sanction in the Indian census report of 1901, and which has obtained very general acceptance in India, although perhaps not in Europe. I have assumed that the distinction between Indo-Aryans and Aryo-Dravidians was due to the passage of the Āryas from the thinly peopled grazing grounds of the Panjab to the thickly peopled and agricultural country of the Gangetic valley. The difference between the two areas has made itself felt at every subsequent period of Indian history, and it is reasonable to suppose that it did so in prehistoric times. The rival theory bases itself upon the language. The modern Sanskritic vernaculars of Northern India date from about A.D. 1000, and philologists have classified

<sup>1</sup> Strabo, xv, 41, p. 702; Pliny, HN., vi, 19, 66.

them in three groups—an inner, an intermediate, and an outer group. Western Hindi, the vernacular of the Gangetic Doab, is the typical example of the inner group, and it differs from the outer group in phonetics, but chiefly in grammar.<sup>1</sup> It is derived, like the English, from a synthetic speech, but it is now, also like the English, analytic in its conjugations and declensions. The languages of the outer group are still synthetic. Now the transition from synthesis to analysis, and *vice versa*, is a common linguistic phenomenon, and several languages of the outer group have shown a tendency to become analytic, and then have become synthetic again. Why Western Hindi pursued the course it did we do not know, but it is suggested that the original dialect of which modern Hindi is a development must have contained some natural tendency towards analysis which was foreign to the other dialects of Sanskritic origin. The speakers, therefore, of this dialect, it is said, must in that case have been distinct from the other Vedic tribes; nor could they have come with them. Doubtless they were a band of military adventurers who settled in the Doab, and not having brought their women with them, took wives from the Dravidians for themselves. Out of this crossing, so it is asserted, the Aryo-Dravidian was born.

Now it is certain that the Āryas spoke various dialects; some of the tribes were barely intelligible to each other; and the Paisāchī, which was widely spoken in the Panjab, was not Vedic at all. Very possibly Western Hindi may have developed from one of these archaic dialects, which differed from the rest. Whether this be so or no—and it is a mere hypothesis—the further suggestion that the speakers of this dialect brought no women with them appears to be gratuitous and untenable. Any band of adventurers marching rapidly without women would

<sup>1</sup> Sir G. A. Grierson tells me that he lays even more stress upon the phonetic differences than upon the grammatical.



necessarily be small, while the permanent modification of the Dravidian type presupposes a very large infusion of Aryan blood. This objection alone is fatal to the theory. And there are other objections equally valid. The original Ārya of the Gangetic plain clearly was the same in physique as the Indo-Aryan of the Panjab. Moreover, had all these hypothetical invaders been obliged to marry native women there could have been no question of a purer or a less pure Aryan descent. But this very claim is the foundation of caste. The compilation of the Rīg Veda was the work of the Aryo-Dravidian schools; why should they have devoted themselves to a literature which was not their own? "It is quite impossible," says Professor Keith, "to find any support for this theory in Vedic literature."<sup>1</sup>

<sup>1</sup> *Vedic Index*, ii, p. 126, n. 14. The theory in question is set forth in the chapters on Ethnology and Language in the *Census of India Report*, 1901, and summarized in the *Imperial Gazetteer of India, the Indian Empire*, vol. i, pp. 303, 358; v. also Sir H. Risley, *The Peoples of India*, p. 55. The theory had its origin in the linguistic crux, and was for a long time confined to the philologists, who posited a separate section of the Āryas speaking a Vedic speech different in grammar and phonetics from the rest. Hillebrandt, in his *Vedische Mythologie*, vol. i, pp. 94-116, gave these speculations definite shape. The deeds of Sudās and his father Divodāsa are celebrated in the 6th and 7th Mandalas of the R. V. Hillebrandt holds that the Divodāsa of the 6th Mandala is a wholly different person from the Divodāsa of the 7th. The Divodāsa of the 6th Mandala combats the Panis, Dāsas, Pārāvatas, and others; and Hillebrandt equates these with the Scythic nomads, the Parni or Assarni, and the Dahæ; the Pārāvatas are Ptolemy's Παρῳῆται, and the Sarasvatī of this Mandala is the Haraquaiti, the Arachotus or Helmund. This earlier Divodāsa lived on the Helmund in Arachosia; the Pūrus were his neighbours; and at a much later period his descendants led the Bharatas to India, whither the Pūrus also migrated. He concludes that there was a double invasion, an earlier and a later, and from two different quarters. Sir H. Risley improved upon this. He placed the main body of the Āryas in Arachosia and Seistan, while a second body of adventurers, travelling without wives, entered India by way of Gilgit and Chitral. I am not aware that any ethnologist has followed Sir H. Risley in this matter. Any invaders of India coming from Arachosia or Seistan would come by way of Kandahar and the Bolan, and would naturally spread in the

first instance over the Lower Indus, whereas the Āryas of whom we have knowledge were on the Kabul River and in the North-West Panjab. All these speculations appear to me baseless. I am not a philologist, and I can offer no solution of the linguistic puzzle; but surely that does not require such violent hypotheses. As Sir G. Grierson has said with regard to it: "It is immaterial whether we are to look upon the state of affairs as two invasions, or as the earlier and later invasions of a series extending over a long period of time." The Bharatas were late-comers; they regarded the speech of the Pūras as barbarous; and philologists may have some right in claiming them as the missing element, provided that there is no other solution of the question. For a fuller discussion of the subject r. Sir G. A. Grierson's and Professor Berriedale Keith's papers in the J.R.A.S. for 1908 and 1917.

*(To be continued.)*

---



## XVI

### GESTURE IN SUMERIAN AND BABYLONIAN PRAYER

#### A STUDY IN BABYLONIAN AND ASSYRIAN ARCHÆOLOGY

BY S. LANGDON, PH.D., PROFESSOR OF ASSYRIOLOGY, OXFORD

RELIGIOUS worship is abundantly illustrated in many of its most important aspects by scenes engraved on Sumerian, Babylonian, and Assyrian seal cylinders. Chronologically the seals of this region illustrate nearly every period of the long history of these peoples and the changing rituals and beliefs of their religion. A very large proportion of the seals represent the owner of the seal approaching a deity in the attitude of prayer. This is especially true of the glyptique of Sumer and Akkad, where the proportion of this type of seal to all others is much greater than in Assyria. In the northern empire the Assyrians are not so much attached to the scenes of worship, but even here this *motif* is well represented. The engravers of cylinders in all periods probably kept in stock seals engraved with the scene of the private prayer as the custom imposed in their periods. The human who is figured standing before a god, or in Assyria more frequently before a divine symbol, is not a portrait of the owner of the seal. The owner regards himself rather as represented and symbolized by the conventional figure. In those cases in which the engraver produced a seal cylinder at the command of a Sumerian or Babylonian, perhaps, we may regard the praying figure as an approximate portrait. That scenes of this kind are standardized products of the various

periods representing the religious ideas, but not actual portraits, is proven by Cassite seals of women on which a male figure takes the place of the worshipper.<sup>1</sup> The example of a portrait of a woman worshipper on Ward No. 536 would in itself prove that the praying figures on Babylonian seals actually represent the owners. But even more direct evidence for this important fact may be adduced. The Aramaic traders and adventurers who settled in Assyria and Babylonia in great numbers in the late period adopted the cylinder seal. They obviously purchased these from Assyrian and Babylonian engravers, whose designs are purely of the accepted type. The owners probably cared nothing for the religious symbolism and scenes on the seals. They worshipped other gods and adhered to other forms of religion. But in many cases these Aramaic citizens of Assyria caused their names to be inscribed in Aramaic letters beside the design. On the seal reproduced here (Fig. 1) from about the seventh century B.C. we have typical Assyrian symbols. Winged genii adore the winged disk of the sun-god. The owner of the seal stands supplicating the forked lightning, symbol of Adad, the thunder-god. Beside the design is written in Aramaic, "Jarp'el, son of Hur-'adad." To ensure the identity of the figured person the engraver repeats the name (which is engraved very closely beside the figure) "Jarp'el".

This evidence adds a very important fact to our knowledge of Babylonian religion. The praying figures on seals actually represent the owners. Of that we can no longer doubt. Sumerians, Babylonians, and Assyrians carried about on their seals representations of themselves as they said their prayers before one of the great gods.

<sup>1</sup> Ward, *Seal Cylinders of Western Asia*, No. 536, is an example of a portrait. The seal belongs to the woman Menarubtum and the praying figure is a woman. But see *Collection de Clercq*, 262, seal of Uššurtum with male figure in the scene. See also *ibid.* 265, seal of *Tāb-nišk-reši*.

These were supported from the neck by a stout cord which passed through an aperture at the axis of the cylinder. I propose here to study the various attitudes of the worshipper's hands in the different periods, and to compare these attitudes with those which characterize the worship of adjacent peoples.

The early period of Sumerian glyptique, commonly known as pre-Sargonic, has generally the so-called processional scene. This will be illustrated by Figs. 2, 3, 4, and 5. Seals of this type represent the owner conducted into the presence of a great seated deity by his own personal god, who leads his *protégé* by the hand. In case the procession moves from left to right the man's god or goddess takes the worshipper's left hand. In the reversed direction the man is led by the right hand. By this design the artist brings the disengaged arm nearest the observer. Occasionally the disengaged arm is employed to carry a lamb or kid as an offering. On Fig. 3 the owner is conducted by his goddess. On Fig. 2 an attendant brings the animal sacrifice; the reader will observe that this attendant approaches with the right arm extended and the fore-arm raised parallel with the face, *palm inward*. Observe also that the conducting deities approach with disengaged arm raised in a similar manner *palms inward*. On seal Fig. 7 three deities approach the seated grain goddess. The central figure (a goddess) of these three has the most ancient attitude of prayer for humans, the raised hand *palm inward* and the disengaged arm folded at the waist. These are all extremely archaic types extending back to a period as early as 3500 B.C. From them we conclude that man when not conducted by a deity stood in the position of prayer described above. This is apparently the original prayer attitude of prehistoric man in Sumer. For this attitude of primitive man see also the following extremely archaic seals, Delaporte, *Bibliothèque Nationale*, 51, 53, 59;

Ward, 90, 91, 302; Delaporte, *Musée Guimet*, 25, 26; *Collection de Clercq*, 83.<sup>1</sup>

Although such was the orthodox pose of adoration in the most ancient times a few exceptions from the same period should be noted. Fig. 6, a product of the engraver's art well toward the end of the pre-Sargonic period, say 2900 B.C., shows the human with *both* hands folded at the waist. His god, double-faced, and goddess precede him in the ordinary pose of the period. On a much more ancient seal, *Musée Guimet*, 23, the owner stands in the same attitude, *both* hands at the waist. A seal to be placed at the end of the archaic period has two humans, a bearded Semite owner of the seal attended by a Sumerian priest (?). The owner is in the second pose, and so is an inferior deity who stands behind the seated goddess (drawn double *vis-à-vis*). The priest has the orthodox position with the modification that the palm is not turned inward but faces the left (*De Clercq*, No. 82). This later modification of the ordinary pose will be seen on Fig. 8. The hand is thus brought into such position that the narrow surface on the side of the little finger is turned toward the deity. It is possible that the seals Figs. 7 and 8 may be assigned to the period of Sargon and Naram-Sin.

The second or Sargonic period of glyptique, say 2800-2600, does not introduce the scene of adoration and prayer to any great extent. Scenes from the Gilgamesh Epic are by far the most common here. On a seal of Naram-Sin, *Rev. d'Assyr.*, iv, 11, the praying figure has the older orthodox position. To this period belongs the scene of a row of inferior deities adoring the seated sun-god (Delaporte, *Bibliothèque Nationale*, 72, 63, 64). The deity who heads the procession has nearly the old orthodox pose, the others have the secondary position with both

<sup>1</sup> Seal of *Gimil-il-lu-su . . . ti Me-luh-ha-ki*, "Gimillisu the . . . of Meluhha."

hands folded at the waist. Both attitudes, therefore, obtain in the religious rituals of early Sumerian and Semitic civilization. For the Semitic pose in prayer the cylinders prove nothing, for this people simply adopted the Sumerian custom. It will be seen that the custom of raising the hand *palm inward* was apparently the most ancient and universal, that is, the kiss-throwing hand. Judging from those scenes in which both poses appear, one is induced to believe that the hands folded at the waist indicated an attitude of great humility and penance. The lifted hand, on the contrary, would lay the emphasis on adoration and salutation.

The third period of glyptique includes the seals of the schools of Gudea and Dungi, roughly 2600-2358, or down to the end of the dynasty of Ur.<sup>1</sup> If we may make inferences from the two seals of Gudea (Figs. 9, 10), only the processional scene was admitted on seals in the period following upon the Sargonic dynasty. This is, of course, a pure fancy, and does not enable us to see the real attitude of prayer adopted at this stage of Sumerian religion. Here the worshipper lifts his disengaged arm in exactly the same position as that adopted in the oldest pose. The inference is that in actual worship the Sumerians of the Gudea period stood with right forearm raised before the face *palm inward*. On Fig. 9 the interceding figure of the patesi's goddess has both hands raised, palms at right angle to the face. This position becomes, henceforth, orthodox for the ubiquitous figure of the weeping mother goddess on seals of the Ur, Isin, and Babylonian dynasties. Her very effective attitude is not assumed by humans nor by other deities. Her interceding figure came into the religious art of Sumer through the influence of the liturgies in which the mother goddess is invariably represented as

<sup>1</sup> For the date of the end of the Ur dynasty, see Thureau-Dangin, *Rev. d'Assyr.*, xv, 47.



wailing for the sorrows of humanity.<sup>1</sup> Seals now are engraved almost invariably with the figures facing the right and the right hand of the worshipper raised as described. This fanciful processional scene continues throughout the seals of the Ur period.<sup>2</sup> From it we may perhaps conclude that the worshippers actually stood with right hand raised and the left folded at the waist. In other words this pose in prayer persists from prehistoric times.

But for some unexplained reason a second attitude begins to be assumed about the age of Dungi (2456-2399), illustrated by our Fig. 12. The secondary position of pre-Sargonic times is again assumed. The man's conducting god or goddess disappears; only the liturgical figure of the mother goddess standing behind the penitent remains. This attitude is exceedingly popular in the school of Ur, and may be seen on a great number of seals.<sup>3</sup> What can be the influence which caused this important change in the attitude of prayer? In the preceding pages the position was explained as one of humility and penance. Its prominence here is probably to be attributed to the same religious movement which introduced the figure of the interceding mother goddess, namely, the influence of the great liturgical schools which emphasized the element of sorrow and penance. These lugubrious liturgies seem to have held powerful sway over mankind in that period.

Archæological evidence undisputably confirms two

<sup>1</sup> See the writer's *Babylonian Liturgies*, xl, and especially *Tammuz and Ishtar*, p. 111. In the Cassite and later period (pre-Neo-Babylonian) the engraved *kuburru* frequently represent the seated goddess Gula with hands raised in the same way.

<sup>2</sup> A bas-relief of a processional scene occurs on the stone tablet of Nabuapaliddin, king of Babylon 890-854 B.C., published in V Raw. 60. The relief is apparently modelled after a very ancient one, probably of the age of Ammizaduga, see *Vorderasiatische Bibliothek*, vol. iv, p. 50, by the writer.

<sup>3</sup> See Delaporte, *Bibliothèque Nationale*, Nos. 98-128. *Collection de Clercy*, 171. *Musée Guimet*, 42-4.

accepted attitudes of prayer down to the end of the Ur dynasty. Of these the more ancient and important is the raised right arm, forearm parallel to the face, and palm inward. Left arm folded at the waist. This is the pose exclusively adopted henceforth in Babylonia. It is the attitude assumed by the great Hammurabi on the famous *stèle* of Susa. In the majority of cases the palm is certainly turned inward.<sup>1</sup> A tendency to turn the forearm and wrist so as to bring the palm at right angles with the face manifests itself on a few seals.<sup>2</sup> This is usually the position seen on seals of the Cassite period, as our Fig. 13 shows.<sup>3</sup>

At this point we may arrest the archæological discussion and turn to its literary aspect. The orthodox pose in prayer in Babylonia was the one imposed by Sumerian practice. The person stood left foot forward, right arm extended at right angle, forearm raised parallel to the body, palm inward or side-wise, left arm folded at the waist. It may be defined as the Sumerian custom. This accords with the Sumerian word for prayer, *šu-il-la* or *šu-il-lu-kam*, translated into Semitic by *niš kati*, "the lifting of the hand."<sup>4</sup> No examples of Sumerian *šu-il-lu* prayers have survived from the classical period.<sup>5</sup> We do not know precisely how the Sumerians employed

<sup>1</sup> Delaporte, *Bibliothèque Nationale*, 129-150. *Collection de Clercq*, 169, 170, 172.

<sup>2</sup> For example, Ward, *Morgan Collection*, No. 98; Delaporte, *Bibliothèque Nationale*, 151 (left hand raised due to archaic influence; the engraver adopted the old method showing the raised hand farthest from the observer). It is the poise of the hand assumed by Hammurabi on the Susa *stèle*.

<sup>3</sup> Note also the position of the hand of *Bēlahē-erba*, an official of Merodachballadin (end of eighth century), as he stands before his king on the well-known *kudurru* of Berlin (Hinke, *A New Boundary Stone*, p. 72; see also p. 23).

<sup>4</sup> See IV Raw. 20, 9; ASKT. 127, 57; IV R. 17a, 53.

<sup>5</sup> IV Raw. 53, iii, 44-iv, 28, a list of forty prayers of this kind. The list is restored by a text, K. 3276, published in the writer's *Babylonian Liturgies*, No. 103.

these prayers, but evidence points to their original use as pure orisons and unconnected with magic ceremonies or incantations. The Sumerians, of course, possessed long incantation ceremonies, as we know from unpublished tablets in Constantinople. But they did not associate pure prayer with incantation as the Semites did. We possess one Sumerian *šu-il-la* or prayer of the lifting of the hand with a Semitic translation, and this is identical with what we know to have been the penitential prayers *er-šaḡ-lun-gà*, or "weeping to appease the heart". We know that the Sumerians employed a large number of the latter kind of prayers. Inasmuch as the texts repeatedly confuse the two, we may assume that both forms of prayer were confined to the private worship in distinction from the liturgies and *eršemma* hymns, or compositions for public service. The details concerning the Sumerian hymnal technology are intricate, and the discussion has been prolonged in the article on "Prayer (Babylonian)" in Hastings' *Encyclopædia of Religion and Ethics*. My opinion is that the *eršaḡlun-ga* prayers, commonly called "penitential prayers", were sung at a private service by a priest, whereas the *šu-il-la* prayers were recited by the *persona orans*. It is possible that the attitude with hands folded at the waist is the one assumed by the worshipper in the more formal *eršaḡlun-ga*. In any case the common attitude supplied by archæological remains is clearly the one which gave the name to the ordinary prayers of the "lifting of the hand".

It is not possible to study the archæology of seals after the Cassite period in Babylonia. An age of internal disorder marks the history of Babylonia from the twelfth to the end of the sixth century. When Nabopolassar restored a stable kingdom in 625 B.C. Babylonian glyptic had become a servile copy of Assyrian sphragistic. Now we have almost exclusively the signet type of seal as it was used in Assyria. On few of these

late seals does the old Babylonian pose in prayer survive.<sup>1</sup>

Although the Assyrian religion borrowed its prayers exclusively from the Babylonians, and employed the same names for them in both Sumerian and Semitic, nevertheless they usually modified the kiss-throwing raised hand, and also retained the old Semitic open-hand pose. Be it first remarked that when the Assyrians employed the phrase "lifting of the hand" for prayer the term was purely technical, borrowed along with the prayers themselves, and frequently applied to another attitude of orisons. The Assyrians retained the spirit and cult practices of Semitic religion much more than their kinsmen of the south. The Sumerian poses in prayer are not the only ones here. By far the most common attitude of prayer in Assyria is illustrated on Figs. 14 and 15. The feet are in the same position as in Sumer, but the left arm, instead of being folded at the waist, is extended at right angle with the body from the elbow. The right arm is properly in the same position (see Fig. 14) as in Sumer, but the forearm and hand turn *outward*, the index finger pointing at the god or sacred object with thumb closed over the three remaining fingers.<sup>2</sup> This attitude is similar to one seen in Greece, and is the kiss-throwing hand in a new position. The pointed hand is a late *motif* which I shall discuss below in connexion with a similar Greek pose.<sup>3</sup> On Fig. 16 is seen what I believe to be the true Semitic attitude of prayer of the Assyrians and Hebrews. Here both hands are extended

<sup>1</sup> The following Assyrian seals probably belong in reality to Babylonia, and are to be assigned to the period of Shamash-shum-ukin, *Collection de Clercq*, 373, 372. Ward, *Seals of the Morgan Collection*, 145, assigns a seal with the old Sumerian processional scene to Assyria; it is difficult to understand why Ward came to this conclusion. If the seal really be early Assyrian we have an example of Sumerian influence in Assyria.

<sup>2</sup> See also Delaporte, *Bibliothèque Nationale*, 327, 330 *et passim*.

<sup>3</sup> I refer naturally to the figure of the human here and elsewhere. The pose of the deities does not concern this discussion.

palms inward in the act of receiving blessings from the deity.<sup>1</sup> Unfortunately all early Assyrian seals are devoted to other symbolism, consequently we cannot arrange the types of religious pose in chronological order. Fig. 17 shows a seal of an Aramæan, on which he represents himself as a eunuch in the same position as on the previous seal. The inscription reads, "Belonging to Akdebān, son of Gebrod, the eunuch who worships Adad."<sup>2</sup> We have here undeniably pure Semitic influence and type. On the same seal to the right stands a priest(?) in the Assyrian attitude of prayer defined above.

Naturally the more widely adopted position with left arm held to the side and forearm extended palm upward is due to influence of the open-hand position or true Semitic type. On Fig. 1, another Aramæan seal, the owner, Jarp'el, stands in an attitude which combines the two positions. The right hand has the true Semitic pose; the position of the left hand is influenced by the more common Assyrian attitude. On a seal of the *Musée Guimet*<sup>3</sup> the owner stands in the Assyrian pointed-finger attitude, but the eunuch has the Assyrian and Semitic open-hand position.<sup>4</sup> Excellent examples of the open-hand pose will be seen on No. 327 of the *Collection de Clercq*, No. 113 of the *Musée Guimet*, No. 312 of the *Bibliothèque Nationale*.<sup>5</sup>

In the Neo-Babylonian and Persian periods on the signet type of seal the open-hand position again prevails to the exclusion of all others. Figs. 18 and 20 will

<sup>1</sup> The Stèle of Senecherib represents that king with pointed right hand in praying position. The left hand is in the usual Assyrian position, elbow at left hip, but here it holds a short sword. See R. A. xi, 189.

<sup>2</sup> See also *Collection de Clercq*, 326 bis.

<sup>3</sup> No. 109 of Delaporte's Catalogue.

<sup>4</sup> G. A. Cooke, *North Semitic Epigraphy*, pl. xi, 2.

<sup>5</sup> Last two numbers refer to Delaporte's Catalogues.

illustrate this period. The consensus of evidence, therefore, indicates that the peculiar Assyrian attitude of prayer with pointed index finger was sporadic, only partially true Assyrian, and was abandoned in later times by the Babylonians, who adopted the open-hand position. This conclusion, which has been made on archæological remains alone, is effectively corroborated by Assyrian texts. In their native vernacular the term for to pray was "to open the *hands*", not "to raise the *hand*" as in Sumer and Babylonia. This philological commentary upon the archæological evidence is so important that I introduce it here in the body of this discussion. A hymn to Nebo by Asurbanipal has the following line:—

*ip-te-te* <sup>iu</sup> *Ašur-bani-apal up-ni-šu it-ta-na-aḥ-ḥar a-na*  
<sup>iu</sup> *Nabû bēli-šu.*

"Asurbanipal opened his hands and presented himself before Nebo his lord." (Craig, R.T., i, 6, rev. 1.)

In an Assyrian letter a priest writes to his king:—

*up-ni-ia ap-te-ti ilāni* <sup>ni</sup> *us-sa-ar-ri-ir.*

"I have opened my hands and prayed to the gods."  
(Harper, *Letters*, No. 23, rev. 6.)

An Assyrian hymn to Ishtar has the following passage:—

*pa-ta-ni up-na-ia-a a-na* <sup>iat</sup> *Be-lit šamē u-ṣal-la.*

"My hands are opened and I pray to the queen of heaven." (K. 890, published in transcription only by Arthur Strong, B.A., ii, 634.)

The same attitude was assumed by vanquished princes before their Assyrian conquerors:—

*'u-a-ai zar-biṣ i-bak-ki-ma pi-ta-a ub-na-a-šu u-ṣal-la-a*  
*bē-lu-ti.*

"(He ascended the wall of his city) wailing bitterly 'oh woe!' and his hands were opened as he prayed to my lordship." (Inscription of Assarhaddon describing

the capture of the king of Šupria, Winckler, *Forschungen*, ii, 28.)

The son of a defeated king of the land of Mannai prays to Asurbanipal as follows:—

*up-na-a-šu ip-ta-a u-ṣal-la-a bélu-u-ti.*

“He opened his hands and implored my lordship.”  
(Rassam Cylinder, iii, 17, in V Raw., pl. iii.)

The open-hand position was, therefore, the traditional Semitic attitude of prayer as illustrated by Assyrian, late Babylonian, and Aramaic seals. This was undoubtedly the attitude among the Hebrews. Here we have almost no archæological evidence. The seal (Fig. 21) from Moab east of the Jordan is the only design of this kind hitherto discovered in Palestine. Here only the right hand is represented in the half-elevated open pose. The inscription reads, “Belonging to Eliamas, son of Elisha.”<sup>1</sup>

The evidence of the Hebrew texts is, however, conclusive. The expression here is *pāraś ēth-kappim*, “he spread out the hands.” It occurs in the earliest Hebrew sources as Exodus ix, 29; ix, 33; Isaiah i, 15; Job xi, 13, etc. The attitude is one naturally assumed by those who look upward to heaven. Thus we have its essentially original implication in the description of Solomon’s adoration of Jahweh, 1 Kings i, 22, “And Solomon stood before the altar of Jahweh in the presence of all the congregation of Israel and he spread out his hands to heaven.” Undoubtedly this Semitic position in prayer

<sup>1</sup> A stèle with Aramaic inscription found at Nerab, south-east of Aleppo, in Syria, has the bas-relief figure of a priest of the moon-god. The priest’s name, *Sin-zēr-ibni*, clearly reveals his Assyrian origin. The right hand is raised in the half-turned kissing-hand pose, the left hand being held in Assyrian fashion, elbow at the hip, forearm straight forward, holding a wide double-edged knife. The date is probably post-Assyrian and of the period of Nebuchadnezzar and Astyages. Clearly the figure is under Assyrian and Persian influence, and cannot be used in the discussion of West Semitic religious gesture. For the inscription see Cooke, *North Semitic Inscriptions*, 186, and for the figure, Clermont-Ganneau, *Album d’Antiquités Orientales*, pl. i.

emphasizes the reception of grace and favour from a deity who dwells in the sky. That can easily be accounted for in Hebrew. They regarded their god, Jahweh, as a sky-god from the beginning. The raised open-hand position is assumed when praying unto a far-away celestial deity; prayer before a statue naturally demands a different pose. Since in pure Hebrew worship statues of the national god were forbidden we consequently find this to be the orthodox position among them. Inasmuch as the Hebrew pose in orisons appears also to have been the original Assyrian custom, we may assume that it was common to Semitic peoples. In Assyria the position is assumed before statues and divine symbols which is explained by the intrusion of the open-hand pose toward far-away gods into the cults as practised before statues. We have already observed that the Babylonians adopted this Assyrian position from the sixth century onward. It will be remembered that here the palms are held upward. Emphasis is here laid upon the desire to receive gifts from the deity.

The Semitic open-hand pose is the one also employed by the Greeks and Romans when supplicating sky-gods. It is the so-called *supinae manus* of the Romans; *calo supinas si tuleris manus*, "If thou liftest unto heaven thy hands bent backward," says Horace to the rustic maid Phidyle (*Odes*, Bk. iii, 23, 1). The same attitude was prevalent in Greek religion, where a number of expressions for lifting the hands (*ἀνατείνειν τὰς χεῖρας*) are common from Homer onward. Here, as in Assyria, the open-hand attitude may be assumed before statues, and the idea may be expressed by holding out only one hand in this attitude, derived from the custom of employing the other hand to present a cup of libation to the statue or sacred object. We have noted the same one-hand pose on the seal from Moab.

We may assume that the Semites, the Greeks, and



Romans all worshipped in the open-hand position, arms raised, palms bent inwards. The position expresses supplication. This is the pose assumed by the Greek verb *ἱκετεύειν*, to approach (*ἵκω*) in prayer, to supplicate. The psychology of this attitude is entreaty, and in this discussion it will be designated as the open-hand pose, or *gestus supplicationis*.

Now we have seen that the Babylonians, although the oldest and most important branch of early Semitic races, did not employ the *supplicatio* position in prayer until the Neo-Babylonian period, when Assyrian influence prevailed. That is due to their complete adoption of Sumerian ideas and customs. The expression of religious emotions by means of the hands is profoundly different in Sumerian. Here the kissing hand so prevalent in Greece and Rome prevails from the very earliest period. The act of throwing a kiss to a statue or sacred object is equally primitive in Sumer. In Greece the gesture gave a word for the act, *προσκυνεῖν*, "to throw a kiss," to adore, to venerate. The Latins render this idea by *adorare*, *venerari*. It is the second great hand movement in religious psychology, and fundamentally conveys the idea of salutation, greeting, adoration. I shall designate this as the "kiss hand" pose or *gestus adorationis*.

In our previous analysis of the Sumerian archæology we saw that the processional scene is probably the oldest Sumerian idea of pose in worship. If a priest assumed the rôle of the conducting deity, then the design is not fanciful but real. At any rate the processional scene, which is based on the idea of a divine intercessor, occurs only in Sumerian and Egyptian religious art, and is another convincing strand of relationship between these two great religions. If the reader will refer to Fig. 2 he will see three characteristically Sumerian attitudes of worship. The seal is prehistoric and may be dated at

about 3500 B.C. The second figure from the right carries in his left arm a kid, and with his right arm he throws a kiss. The hand is here placed in the position of just having left the lips, and is retained in this position throughout Sumerian art.

The first figure on the right has the hands folded at the waist. That is the second great attitude of hand expression, and denotes humility, submission, contrition, the fundamental and characteristic sentiment of Sumerian religion.<sup>1</sup> It is apparently unknown in other ancient religions of the Mediterranean area, except in so far as it was adopted by the Babylonians and Hittites. We have seen that the folding of *both* hands at the waist was particularly common in the period of Dungi in the twenty-fifth and twenty-fourth centuries B.C., after which period it completely disappears in Babylonia. The fact that this pose continues in Hittite religion can lead to only one conclusion, namely, that the Hittites came under Sumerian influence in Asia Minor and Anatolia in the twenty-fifth century B.C., when the Sumerian dynasty of Ur is known to have been recognized in this region.<sup>2</sup> The exact method of closing one hand upon the other cannot be detected on seals, for the execution is too minute. But it can be studied in detail on the statues of Gudea.<sup>3</sup> The right hand is clasped by the left hand in an extraordinary manner, so that the right thumb lies against the body and right fingers lie almost horizontal. The position is physically impossible, and only an exaggeration of the natural clasp seen in the bas-relief of Asarladdon at Sendschirli.<sup>4</sup> It is curious

<sup>1</sup> See the writer's *Babylonian Liturgies*, pp. xxxix f.

<sup>2</sup> Thureau-Dangin, *Rev. d'Assyr.*, 8, 144, contract sealed by a cylinder dedicated to Ibi-Sin. Note also the Cappadocian seals on plate i which accompanies Th.D.'s article; here the poses in prayer are those of the period of Dungi.

<sup>3</sup> See, for example, Heuzey, *Antiquités Chaldéennes*, No. 50.

<sup>4</sup> *Ausgrabungen in Sendschirli*, Königliche Museen zu Berlin, Mitteilungen aus den Orientalischen Sammlungen, Heft xi, Tafel iii.

that the clasped-hand position should have survived only in bas-reliefs in Assyria.<sup>1</sup> In early seals the processional scene represents the human, who is led by a deity, with the disengaged arm folded at the waist. See also Fig. 4. In later times, from Gudea to Dungi, the disengaged hand is in the kissing position (Fig. 11). This of course means that in early Sumerian religion the conducted worshipper approached with folded hands, whereas in later times he approaches in the act of adoration. We have noted how the folded-hand position obtained great popularity in the period of Dungi (Fig. 12), and finally disappeared altogether in favour of the kissing-hand position with one arm folded at the waist. This widely adopted attitude of Babylonian religion seems to have been introduced by the Semites of the first dynasty as a simple means of combining the two principal religious poses of the Sumerians. They thus combined the ideas of salutation and humility. We have also noted how in Babylonia down through the Cassite period there is a tendency to arrest the kiss-throwing hand in a position of half turn towards the god's statue. The gesture was continued in Assyria and in Western Semitic centres under Assyrian influence.

We are now in a position to understand the extraordinary pointed-finger attitude of the Assyrians (see Fig. 14), as they worshipped before statues and sacred symbols. It is really the kiss-throwing hand arrested in the last stage of the act and thrown with the index finger only. The thumb is closed over the other three fingers, and the index finger lies on the thumb.<sup>2</sup> The left hand instead of being retained in the folded position remains in the open-hand position common to the Semites. Here also we have a combination, but a combination of

<sup>1</sup> See the Louvre bas-relief of the palace of Sargon, *Assyrian Sculptures*, Kleinemann & Co., plate vi, grand vizier and eunuch.

<sup>2</sup> This Assyrian position can best be seen in *Assyrian Sculptures*, part i, photograph on the cover.

a Sumerian or Greek pose with a Semitic pose, the whole denoting salutation and supplication.

Now this Assyrian transformation of the old Sumerian kissing hand with palm inward and fingers bent near to the lips has a parallel in Greece. Here also the kissing hand begins in exactly the same position as among the ancient Sumerians.<sup>1</sup> Then the index finger is put to the lips, the thumb being closed over the other three fingers as described above.<sup>2</sup> But the Greeks also transformed the attitude, arresting it in the act of throwing the kiss, or the pointed-finger position.<sup>3</sup> Other forms of the kissing hand in Greece occur. For example, the bas-relief of the Apotheosis of Homer, fourth register, represents the adorers with hand thrown outward or the original gesture arrested in the last stage.<sup>4</sup> Occasionally the hand is held to the lips with fingers slightly drawn together to the thumb.<sup>5</sup>

The Assyrian attitude with pointed index finger is, therefore, prevalent in Greece, and may possibly be due to Assyrian influence in Greek lands. In any case the kiss-throwing hand seems to have been an attitude common to Semitic peoples. If we may assume the Assyrian pointed-finger pose as true to type we may conclude that this was the pose employed by the Bā'al worshippers of Canaan or the early Semitic inhabitants

<sup>1</sup> See Baumeister's *Denkmäler des Klassischen Altertums*, 592.

<sup>2</sup> This is described by Appuleius in his *Metamorphoseon* (iv, 28), as follows: "admoventes oribus suis dexteram primore digito in erectum pollicem residente" (Placing the right hand to their lips, the index finger lying upon the erect thumb). Professor Percy Gardner is inclined to regard this index-finger attitude in Greece as Oriental, and Appuleius is known to have been under Asiatic influence. But see the bas-relief of the Apotheosis of Homer (Tafel iv of Carl Sittl's *Die Gebürden der Griechen und Römer*), a good classical work of Greek art; in the fourth register the figure of Mnene has the position described by Appuleius.

<sup>3</sup> Baumeister, *ibid.*, 297, fig. 312. Under Oriental influence?

<sup>4</sup> Baumeister, *ibid.*, 112.

<sup>5</sup> Overbeck, *Gallerie heroischer Bildwerke*, xxviii, 7. For the pointed finger see Overbeck, *ibid.*, xi, 8.

of Palestine whose pagan worship so often contaminated the monotheistic religion of their conquerors, the Hebrews. The classic reference to this Canaanitish custom is found in the story of the anointing of Jehu to be king over Israel by Elijah. The narrative in 1 Kings xix, 18 describes the idolatry which had pervaded the Hebrew worship. "And I have left in Israel seven thousand, all the knees which have not bowed to Bā'al and every lip which has not kissed him." These events occurred in the ninth century B.C. From this passage alone one might infer that the Canaanites actually kissed the statues of Bā'al, but a passage in Job, which refers to the same worship several centuries later, admits no doubt concerning the nature of the act. "And if I beheld the luminary how it glows, and the moon passing in splendour, and my heart became perverted in secret, and my hand kissed my lip."<sup>1</sup> The kiss-throwing hand, therefore, persisted in the old pagan religion of Canaan probably as long as Bā'al worship survived. It was rejected by the Hebrews as wicked and sinful because it was connected with the worship of images.

In Egyptian religion the orthodox attitude is entirely different. Here both hands are held out and upward, *palms outward*. It is the pose described by the Romans as *manibus passis implorāre*, "to implore with outstretched hands."<sup>2</sup> The kissing hand in Egyptian religion is doubtful, but in the processional attitude the worshipper who is led by a deity holds his disengaged arm in a position which does suggest the kiss-throwing hand.<sup>3</sup> We have no means of tracing religious poses in


<sup>1</sup> Job xxxii, 26 f.

<sup>2</sup> For examples in Egyptian religion see the *Book of the Dead*, Papyrus Ani, 2nd ed., facsimile by Budge, pl. ii *et passim*. For the pose in Roman religion see the Louvre statue in Bouillon, ii, 29.

<sup>3</sup> See *ibid.* pl. iv, the hawk-headed Horus leads a worshipper to Isis. Egyptologists whom I have consulted unanimously regard the kissing hand as unknown in that religion.

prayer in the early stages of Egyptian religion. All the known representations are from the eighteenth dynasty and later.<sup>1</sup>


Since the kiss-throwing hand was obviously the most important gesture of worship in Sumerian, Babylonian, and Assyrian religion we must surely expect to find the idea reflected in the language itself. We have seen that the Sumerians described the gesture by the colourless phrase *šū-il-la*, "lifting of the hand."<sup>2</sup> Since only one hand is referred to in this term, the description clearly refers to the orthodox position of the right hand as assumed either in processional scenes before the first dynasty or in the Hammurabi pose which supplanted all others. But the original meaning of the gesture is not reflected by this phrase, possibly because it had been forgotten. We are, however, able to trace the attitude both in early Sumerian pictographs and in Sumerian philology. The two sources of interpretation are closely connected, and are discussed together here.



Ideogram for "to salute with a kiss, to adore". Sumerian *sub*, *šub* = *našāku*, to kiss, and *ikribu*, prayer.

A pictograph for prayer occurs on the earliest monuments, and consists of the sign for mouth or face with

<sup>1</sup> But note the hieroglyphic determinative for verbs of praying in

Egyptian . This hieroglyph is extremely ancient. Since it

means "to pray", the hieroglyph is obviously based upon the orthodox gesture in prayer. (Note by Dr. Blackman.)

<sup>2</sup> Translated into Semitic by *niš kati*.

the sign for hand inserted into it.<sup>1</sup> This ideograph has the Sumerian value *sub*, *šub*, the word for "to kiss",<sup>2</sup> which already in the earliest period came to mean "pray, prayer".<sup>3</sup> Since the kiss-throwing hand is the earliest and most important prayer gesture, this ideograph obviously refers to that attitude. A statue of the famous Rim-Sin, king of Larsa, was set up in the temple of the sun-god, and represented him saying his prayers in the kissing-hand pose,<sup>4</sup> precisely as we see Hammurabi on the Susa stèle. The same description is given for a statue of Samsuiluna, king of Babylon in the same period.<sup>5</sup> In liturgical worship of the public services prostration before the statues of the deities must have been ritualistically imposed, at least for the psalmists. One of the rubrics of liturgies is *ki-šub*, which means literally "to kiss the earth", and is translated into Semitic by *šukēna*,<sup>6</sup> to bow down, or by *kaḫkara nuššuku*, "to kiss the earth."<sup>7</sup> This rubric occurred originally after each song of the service, and clearly indicates that at some point in the singing a prostration, or at least a deep bow, was made to the deity.<sup>8</sup> The ideograph and word *sub*, *šub* discussed above commonly mean "prayer", and may be employed as a general word for prayer, but the original and strictly proper sense of both is to salute by the hand kiss.

Another Sumerian expression for a gesture in prayer is

<sup>1</sup> The sign *KA* + *šu* will be found in Thureau-Dangin, REC. No. 198, and its early forms and meanings discussed in PSBA. 1911, 50-2.

<sup>2</sup> In all known texts the verb is written *su-ub* = *našāku*, IV Raw. 9a, 59; K. 5098, obv. 4; PSBA. 1911, 88, 40.

<sup>3</sup> *sub* means both *karābu* and *ikribu*.

<sup>4</sup> *2 alan urudu sub-sub-be d.Ri-im-d.Sin*, "Two copper statues of Rim-Sin in praying (kissing hand) attitude," RA. 15, 7, 12.

<sup>5</sup> PBS. x, 152.

<sup>6</sup> See Geller, ATU. i, 306, 11, *kia-ge-su-ub* = *lu tākina*. Finally, *sub-sub* came to mean "bow down".

<sup>7</sup> IV Raw. 9a, 59.

<sup>8</sup> Later *kišub*, *ki-šu-bi-im* came to mean "strophe" simply. See BJL. p. xlv.

commonly supposed to mean "prostration of the face to the earth". It has been so interpreted because the Semites invariably translate the expression by *labān appi*, "to prostrate the face." The usual Sumerian term is *ka-šu-gál*, and occasionally *ka-šu-tag*.<sup>1</sup> Neither of these terms conveys the idea of prostration. The second term clearly means "to touch the mouth with the hand". The first term is more difficult, for no suitable meaning can be found for the verb *gál*.<sup>2</sup> Since, however, *gál*<sup>3</sup> means *našú*, "to lift," the term may possibly mean "to lift the hand to the mouth". The original meaning of this phrase probably refers to the kiss-throwing hand also. At any rate the Sumerians clearly attached some special meaning to this act. In classical texts it invariably describes prayer in a temple before a statue.<sup>4</sup> It also describes the attitude of a penitent when he recites the penitential prayers called *eršuglunga*.<sup>5</sup> In my previous pages I suggested that the folded hands may be the pose assumed here. In any case this term, *ka-šu-gál*, although originally referring to the kissing hand, clearly denotes bowing, at least in actual usage. It is employed of reducing foreign lands to submit to the yoke of

<sup>1</sup> *ka šu-ša-ra-ab-tag-gi-ne = appa-šina lilbinakum*, "may they bow their faces to thee," King, LIH. iii, 174, 16. Of Innini the king Ishme-Dagan says, *ka šu-ša-ra-ab-tag-gi*, "I will bow the face to thee," PSBA. 1918, 54, 15.

<sup>2</sup> The meaning *labānu* for *gál* is derived by Semites from their own rendering of *ka-šu-gál*.

<sup>3</sup> The variant *ma-al* occurs, and since *ma-al* usually stands for *gál* = *šakānu*, to institute, cause to be, perhaps the meaning of the phrase is rather "to place the hand to the mouth". Either of these interpretations is difficult since they violate Sumerian syntax, the object coming after the locative noun. The choice of interpretation given in the note is strengthened by the form *ka-šu-mar-ra-mu = labān appi-ia*, IV R. 20, 9.

<sup>4</sup> SAK. 42a, v, 4; Gudea, Cyl. A. 18, 9; 8, 14; in B. 8, 19 *ka-šu-gál* is employed for the intercessory prayer of a god to the great deity Ningirsu on behalf of the *patesi* Gudea. The term is employed in the same sense in Clay, *Miscel.*, p. 6, iv, 9.

<sup>5</sup> IV Raw. 26, 62, and Var. 27, 36.



a conqueror, and could hardly have obtained that sense unless the act consisted in some such gesture.<sup>1</sup> On the other hand it is employed for the act of an interceding god who conducts his *protégé* by the hand, and cannot possibly refer to prostration.<sup>2</sup> Senecherib, king of Assyria, relates in his Bavian inscription how he made a bas-relief of himself on the rocks of the Tas mountain; and this image of himself stood in the attitude (*lābān appi*) commonly supposed to indicate prostration. But the sculptured rock of Bavian represents Senecherib standing upright in two attitudes; one, in which the figure is marred by a hole in the rock, represents him standing with arms folded at the waist.<sup>3</sup> In any case the Semitic expression means simply supplication, prayer, and not prostration here.<sup>4</sup> The term therefore became colourless, and meant simply supplication.

It is obvious, however, that *bowing*,<sup>5</sup> and even *prostration*,<sup>6</sup> were actually added to the old gesture of salutation with the kissing hand. We should be cautious about deducing principles from the art alone. The sculptors and seal engravers of Sumer, Babylonia, and Assyria avoid the more humble attitudes by tradition, since the laws of ancient art are based upon primitive ideas and remain true to type.

Kneeling is also mentioned in Sumerian and Babylonian

<sup>1</sup> *kur-ri ka-šu-gāl*, "he that causes the foreign land to submit," PBS. x, No. 9, i, 7; *ibid.* 141, 4.

<sup>2</sup> Gudea, Cyl. B. 8, 19.

<sup>3</sup> See Hommel, *Geschichte Babyloniens und Assyriens*, 687. For the inscription see Meissner-Rost, *Bauinschriften Senecheribs* 76, 55. Perhaps Senecherib's inscription at Bavian refers to the scene on the rocks which have fallen into the river, a drawing of which is given in Layard's *Nineveh and Babylon*, p. 72. Here the king stands before Ašur and has the ordinary kiss-throwing hand pose.

<sup>4</sup> W. Schrank, *Babylonische Sühnriten*, p. 58, takes the old view and regards prostration as the original liturgical sense of *ka-šu-gāl* and *lābān appi*.

<sup>5</sup> *šukēnu*.

<sup>6</sup> *lābān appi*.

religious texts, but it does not appear to have been employed in the liturgical worship. As prostration was one of the acts of the penitential psalms (*eršagħunga*), so kneeling appears generally to have been employed in the private prayers of the lifting of the hand (*šu-il-la*). This latter class of prayer was much more informal, and in Babylonian religion usually formed part of the magic rituals of private atonement. "I kneel, I stand, seeking thee," says a prayer to the moon-god employed in the ritual of the house of baptism.<sup>1</sup> Another text prescribes as follows: "On his knees thou shalt cause him to bend, and at the right side of a copper statue thus he shall recite."<sup>2</sup> The text is a ritual for the purification of a house. The word<sup>3</sup> here translated "knee" really means the *tibia*, hence the attitude is unmistakably identical with the position assumed in Christian prayer. A prayer of Asurbanipal is introduced by the rubric: "Kneeling upon his knees<sup>4</sup> Asurbanipal presented himself before Nebo his lord." In a ritual for the purification of a king the rubrics order that the king shall kneel<sup>5</sup> when he recites various prayers of the lifting of the hand. Asurbanipal describes his preparation for an improvised prayer to Ishtar for help in battle: "I stood over against her and kneeled at her feet."<sup>6</sup>

The attitude is mentioned once in a Sumerian penitential psalm, and the gesture may possibly have been accepted in this more formal kind of prayer also.<sup>7</sup> The Semites invariably employed Sumerian in this class of prayer, but provided their texts with a Semitic translation.

<sup>1</sup> King, *Magic*, i, 21, *kamsaku azzaz aše'ka kūšu*.

<sup>2</sup> Craig, RT. 66, 18.

<sup>3</sup> *kinšu*.

<sup>4</sup> *kamis ina kinše-šu*, Craig, RT. 5, 19.

<sup>5</sup> *ikammis-ma kām iḫabbi*, IV Raw. 54b, 20, 22, 24, 26, 28, 30, 42, 44, 46, 48 (here *gam* = *ikammis*).

<sup>6</sup> *akmes šapal-ša*, Streck, *Asurbanipal*, ii, 112, 28.

<sup>7</sup> *i-dé-zu mu-un-gam-ām* = *maḥar-ka kansaku*, psalm to Nergal or Ninurta, IV Raw. 24b, 10.

Seals of the Cassite period actually represent a worshipper in the kneeling position, the hands being retained in the ordinary kissing position.<sup>1</sup> One remarkable seal has the owner in two positions before his god, one in the ordinary standing pose and one in the kneeling posture.<sup>2</sup> The artist draws the kneeling figures much smaller than the standing figures, thus showing that the posture conveyed greater humility.

It seems on the whole certain that kneeling was regarded as an inferior and awkward posture by the Sumerians, and is a Semitic innovation in Babylonia. It is, as we have seen, uncertain whether the Sumerians even permitted prostration in formal worship. The only evidence consists in a phrase (*ka-šu-gal*, *ka-šu-tag*) which the Semites, probably under influence of their own custom, translated by "to prostrate the face", and even this translation refers to the kissing-hand gesture on the inscriptions of Bavian. In Assyria and Babylonia the attitude was largely confined to the informal prayers of magic rituals<sup>3</sup> and to impromptu prayer.<sup>4</sup> On the whole we may say that the Sumerians held kneeling and prostration in much the same low estimate as did the Greeks who regarded the gesture as unworthy of freemen.

It has been noted that the Babylonians when kneeling at prayer retained the ordinary gesture of the hand. The Hebrews follow the same custom when they kneel. Solomon kneeled before the altar and spread out his hands to heaven,<sup>5</sup> thus retaining the orthodox Hebrew hand gesture. In the time of Elijah the Hebrews are

<sup>1</sup> *Collection de Clercq*, 264.

<sup>2</sup> *Ibid.* 258. The half-kneeling figure on a seal of the Cassite period, *Babylonica*, iii, 238, is unique.

<sup>3</sup> IV R. 60b, 19, *ašhur-kunuši aše'-kunuši šapal-kun akmiš*, "I have turned to you, I have sought you, I have kneeled at your feet."

<sup>4</sup> On kneeling, see also Schrank, *Babylonische Sühnriten*, 59 ff., and the writer in *Babyloniaca*, iii, 236 f.

<sup>5</sup> 1 Kings viii, 54; 2 Chron. vi, 13

accused by Jahweh of bowing the knee to the Bā'als of the old pagan religion,<sup>1</sup> which proves that the indigenous Semites of Palestine also employed kneeling in worship.<sup>2</sup> Also Ezra kneeled upon his knees and opened his hands unto Jahweh in prayer,<sup>3</sup> and the pose is spoken of by the writer of the Exilic Psalm 95 in a way which presupposes it as the orthodox attitude. Kneeling must therefore be regarded as essentially Semitic, and the Christian practice is certainly to be traced to that source. In India the clasped hands held palms facing each other, fingers outward, closed and pointed slightly upward, seems to be the only orthodox attitude of prayer in a formal sense. The standing attitude is maintained, the feet being held on the same plane, not in the attitude of advancing.

For permission to reproduce drawings and photographs of seals the writer gratefully mentions the following publishers:—

1. Ernest Leroux, editor of Louis Delaporte's *Catalogues* of the seals in the Bibliothèque Nationale and the Musée Guimet.

2. The Clarendon Press, publishers of G. A. Cooke's *North Semitic Inscriptions*.

3. Maisonneuve Frères et Ch. Leclerc, editors of J. Menant's *Recherches sur la Glyptique Orientale*.

4. The Carnegie Institution of Washington, publishers of W. H. Ward's *The Seal Cylinders of Western Asia*.

5. The J. Pierpont Morgan Library, publisher of W. H. Ward's Catalogue of seals in that private collection.

6. J. C. B. Mohr, publisher of H. Gressmann's *Texte und Bilder*.

<sup>1</sup> 1 Kings xix, 18.

<sup>2</sup> That is, at any rate, a safe inference.

<sup>3</sup> Ezra ix, 5. The Hebrew expression is precisely parallel to the Assyrian, but the words are different, *ekre'ā 'al-birkai*, and Assyrian *akmis ina kīnṣē-ā*.

## INDEX TO THE FIGURES ON THE ACCOMPANYING PLATE.

## FIG.

1. G. A. Cooke, *North Semitic Inscriptions*, pl. xi 3.
  2. L. Delaporte, *Catalogue*, No. 62.
  3. W. H. Ward, *Seal Cylinders*, No. 271.
  4. W. H. Ward, No. 270a.
  5. W. H. Ward, No. 276.
  6. J. Menant, *Glyptique*, vol. i, pl. iii 4.
  7. L. Delaporte, No. 81.
  8. L. Delaporte, No. 79.
  9. *Revue d'Assyriologie*, v, 135.
  10. W. H. Ward, *Morgan Collection*, 52.
  11. J. Menant, *Glyptique*, vol. i, pl. iv 2.
  12. L. Delaporte, No. 111.
  13. L. Delaporte, No. 300.
  14. L. Delaporte, No. 355.
  15. L. Delaporte, No. 354.
  16. W. H. Ward, *Seal Cylinders*, 686.
  17. G. A. Cooke, *North Semitic Inscriptions*, pl. xi 2.
  18. L. Delaporte, No. 532.
  19. L. Delaporte, *Musée Guimet*, No. 145.
  20. H. Gressmann, *Altorientalische Texte und Bilder*, Abbildung, 200.
  21. = Fig. 20, enlarged.
-




Fig. 1.



Fig. 5.



Fig. 9.




Fig. 13.




Fig. 14.



Fig. 18.



Fig. 19.



Fig. 2.



Fig. 6.




Fig. 10.



Fig. 3.



Fig. 7.



Fig. 11.




Fig. 15.



Fig. 20.



Fig. 4.




Fig. 8.



Fig. 12.




Fig. 16.



Fig. 17.



Fig. 21.

# GESTURE IN SUMERIAN AND BABYLONIAN PRAYER.



## XVII

### ON THE JAPANESE SOTOBA, OR ELEMENTAL STŪPA

By JAMES TROUP, late H.M. Consul-General at Yokohama (retired)

WITH A FOLDING PLATE (FIGS. 1-7) AND TEXT-FIGURES

THERE is frequently to be seen in cemeteries and monastery grounds in Japan a stone figure known as the Sotoba. The word is the Japanese pronunciation of the Sanscrit Stūpa, and the parts of the figure represent the Five Elements conceived as composing the Universe, namely: Earth, Water, Fire, Air, and Space. An illustration of it is given in Fig. 1, taken from a Japanese Buddhist picture, in my possession, of the Sumisen, Mount Sumēru, the World Mountain. It may be convenient if the term Elemental Stūpa is used in this paper to designate this figure, so that it may be distinguished from what is usually implied by the word Stūpa in India. The term Sotoba will be used only when reference is made to the Elemental Stūpa in Japan.

Some years ago, while resident in Japan, I paid a visit to the monastery of Koyasan, in Kishyu. Among the other interesting things to be seen there I noted in one of the temples a form, in wood, resembling the Elemental Stūpa, on which were written certain Brāhmī letters. Fig. 3 is a representation, as near as circumstances will permit, of the rough drawing, which I made, at the time, of this Stūpa-form, with its inscription. The uppermost five of the letters are identified<sup>1</sup> as in the illustration, and, reading from the lower portion of the figure upwards to the top, are as follows:—

<sup>1</sup> In this, and as regards other points in this paper, I am indebted for advice and assistance to Professor Takakusu, of Tokyo. Respecting the reading of the letters, etc., see also the Dictionary of Buddhism, *Bukkyo Dai-ji-ten*, compiled by Oda Tokuno, and revised by Takakusu, Nanjio, and others.



इ	<i>a</i> ,	meaning	earth.
व	<i>va</i>	„	water.
र	<i>ra</i>	„	fire.
ह	<i>ha</i>	„	air.
ख	<i>kha</i>	„	space, the void.

In other words, the Sanscrit syllables *a-va-ra-ha-kha* (Japanese pronunciation: *a-ba-ra-ka-kyā*), here represented, bear the meaning of the Five Elements of the Ancients.

The parts of the Sotoba are often expressly indicated (as in the Buddhist Dictionary, *Bukkyō Dai-ji-ten*) by the ordinary Chinese characters for earth, water, fire, and air,—the fifth by the character 空, meaning space or the void.

The form of the Elemental Stūpa was more common, no doubt, in India in earlier times than it is now; but examples of it are to be found there at the present day. Major-General Forlong<sup>1</sup> says he has often seen it in India.

A few years ago I visited Benares, and there, in the mosque known as the Ganj-e-sayed, which is stated to have been constructed from the materials of a Buddhist temple, is to be found, built into the inner wall, a raised portion, in stone, of the form reproduced in Fig. 4, from a rough sketch taken at the time. The form is near enough to assure the identity of the figure with that of the Elemental Stūpa common in Japan. It will be noticed that the topmost two portions of the figure correspond closely with the relative portions in Figs. 1 and 3. The portion next below these consists of a form like the sphere, but compressed on the upper and lower sides,—as is the tendency in representations of the Sotoba,—and has on the front of it, in the centre, a raised form, which may be described as a boss approaching

<sup>1</sup> Major-General J. G. R. Forlong, *Rivers of Life or Faiths of Man*, London, 1883, vol. i, p. 235.

a circular shape. A suggestion is ventured that this stands for the triangular form. The whole erection is time-worn; and a raised triangular form may easily have become transformed into something of an irregular circular shape. The lower portion of the erection may well stand for the rectangular form for earth, with a similar base to it.

The theory of the elements would appear to have been in vogue in India from a very early date. Writing of the Chāndogya Upanishad, Professor Macdonell,<sup>1</sup> referring to the second half of the fifth chapter, indicates an early theory there of three primary elements, heat, water, food, the later number being five,—ether, air, fire, water, earth. Again, the same authority,<sup>2</sup> alluding to the probable dependence of the Greek philosophers on Indian philosophy and science for certain of their doctrines, religious, philosophical, and mathematical—such as the transmigration theory and that of the five elements with which we are here concerned—remarks that almost all those doctrines had their parallels in India in the sixth century B.C.

The five elements are detailed in the metrical version of the *Laws of Manu* (Bühler's translation in S.B.E., vol. xxv), chapter i, sections 76–8; and at p. lxxxvii et seq. of his Introduction, Bühler places parallel to these the corresponding passage of the *Mahābhārata* (ii, 233), where the elements are enumerated and the process of their production described in terms almost identical with those in the first-mentioned composition. Chapter i of this work this scholar takes to be a later addition to the rest, but shows reason at the same time for holding that the editor has not drawn on the *Mahābhārata* for the details given. He shows that the authors of both works have utilized the same materials;

<sup>1</sup> Professor A. A. Macdonell, *History of Sanscrit Literature*, p. 229.

<sup>2</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 422.

and, further, that those materials were not systematic treatises on law and philosophy but the floating proverbial wisdom of the schools already existing in metrical form.

It is not necessary for our purpose here—indeed, it would not be possible—to enter into the question as to how far Greek philosophy had its origin in Oriental sources; but it must at all events be admitted that the Greek philosophers in particular cases received impulses from the East.<sup>1</sup>

Professor J. Burnet<sup>2</sup> remarks that the conception of elements among the Greeks is not older than Empedocles, the Pythagorean.\* At all events, from his time (flor. circa 472-444 B.C.) the Greek philosophers recognized four elements, fire, air, earth, and water, as constituting the primary matter of which the universe is composed,—the “four roots” of all things. Previous philosophers had recognized three primitive substances. Permeating these “roots” or substances, to make motion conceivable, the existence of space had been postulated. The Pythagoreans had spoken of “The Boundless”, called also the void, or empty, as being “inhaled” to keep the units apart. But there was a confusion here, on the one hand between the void and atmospheric air, and between the latter and rarefied mist, on the other. Atmospheric air, however, was shown by Empedocles to be a corporeal substance, not mere empty space, and, further, to be distinct from water. Air came, therefore, to be reckoned a fourth element alongside of the three primitive substances previously recognized, fire, earth, and water,<sup>3</sup> with which, in passing, we may compare the three Indian,—heat, water, and food.

<sup>1</sup> Dr. E. Zeller, *History of Greek Philosophy*, trans. Alleyne, Introduction, p. 34.

<sup>2</sup> Professor J. Burnet, *Early Greek Philosophy*, 2nd ed., p. 56, n. 1, and p. 263.

<sup>3</sup> Burnet, *op. cit.*, loc. cit., and p. 389; Zeller, vol. ii, p. 127.

It will be sufficient, further, for our purpose to trace how the elements came to be represented, in Greece, by geometrical figures. The tradition is that the Pythagoreans explained the elements as being built up of such figures.<sup>1</sup> Speaking of the addition of the fifth element to the four just named above, Zeller<sup>2</sup> says: "The origin of this idea is evidently Pythagorean"; and we have seen above that the existence of space, or the void, was held by that school. "Æther," continues the same writer,—and æther was only another name for the fifth element,—"is admitted by all the philosophers of the older Academy who retrograded from Platonism to Pythagoreism . . . and by Plato himself at the end of his life." But apart from the question of the origin of the addition of the fifth element, we find, on coming to Philolaos (410–400 B.C., resided at Thebes), that he assigned to each of the five elements, strictly speaking to the elementary particles or atoms which compose those substances, a definite geometrical figure.<sup>3</sup> Thus there was assigned to earth, the cube; to fire, the tetrahedron or triangular pyramid; to air, the octohedron, a solid contained by eight equal and equilateral triangles; to water, the icosahedron, a regular solid consisting of twenty triangular pyramids whose vertices meet in the centre of a sphere supposed to circumscribe it; and to the fifth element, "which embraces all the others," the dodecahedron, a regular solid contained under twelve equal and regular pentagons, or having twelve equal bases, thus approaching the spherical form.<sup>4</sup>

The figures thus assigned to earth and fire correspond precisely with those used for them in the ordinary representation of the Elemental Stūpa; that assigned to


<sup>1</sup> Burnet, p. 340.



<sup>2</sup> Zeller, *op. cit.*, i, p. 318, note; see also Burnet, pp. 335–6.



<sup>3</sup> Zeller, i, pp. 436–7.


<sup>4</sup> Burnet, p. 342.

water, although not strictly a sphere, as it appears in the Elemental Stūpa, is near enough to that figure to be easily represented as such when carved in stone. The figure assigned to air cannot be conceived as the same as that which we have for air in the Elemental Stūpa; and a similar remark will apply to the figure assigned to the fifth element.


It has been suggested by Professor Takakusu that the form  used in the Elemental Stūpa to represent air stands for a moiety of the sphere representing water,

both these being mobile elements; while the figure  generally shaped  representing space or æther, as

being akin to air and fire (or light), is a combination of the forms for those two, elements  and .

Plato (*Timæus*, xx-xxii) elaborates a theory of the reciprocal transmutation of the mobile elements, water, fire, and air, following from his showing that their geometrical forms are made up of convertible triangular combinations based respectively on his original scalene triangles. Thus we have it that "when water is divided by fire or by air, it may be formed again and become one particle of fire and two of air". In a similar way one particle of water may be resolved into two and a half of air; or, conversely, two and a half particles of air may coalesce into one of water. It is suggested that this theory may have led to the use of a figure  for air equivalent, as just mentioned, to a section of the sphere representing water, in lieu of the octohedron properly assigned to it, a figure which would not give, in sculpture, a good contrast to the spherical form for water. I have not been able to find any historical ground

for such a suggestion as far as the representation in art is concerned; but if this substitution in the case of air is

admitted, the use of the combined form  for space,

in place of the dodecahedron, may well be conceded.

Plato makes little use of the void. The dodecahedron, which is the fifth regular solid, after the four assigned to the four elements respectively, was reserved by him for the universe (*Timæus*, ii).

From what we have seen the presumption is that the assignation of geometrical forms to the elements was of Greek origin. Garbe, it should be noted,<sup>1</sup> is evidently of opinion that the origin of the Pythagorean numerical philosophy—the doctrine that everything existing is ruled by the mathematical law—is not to be attributed to the Sāṃkhya philosophy. This being so, it will seem to follow that this method of representing the elements was derived by India from Greek sources. Garbe, however, points out<sup>2</sup> that the doctrine of the five elements, that is, the assumption of the fifth element, is common to the Pythagorean school and to India.<sup>3</sup>

When or by whom the three solids, the cube, the icosahedron, the tetrahedron or triangular pyramid, together with the figures for air and space which we are accustomed to see in the Elemental Stūpa, were arranged in that form is not obvious. I have not been able to trace its existence in Western or Western Central Asia, nor in Egypt or Greece.

L. A. Waddell, in his *Buddhism of Tibet* (1895, p. 264), gives a figure of the Tibetan Elemental Stūpa, which he calls the Elemental Ch'orten, having the same form as

<sup>1</sup> Garbe, R., *The Philosophy of Ancient India*, Chicago, 1899, 2nd ed., pp. 44-6; *Die Sāṃkhya Philosophie*, 1894, pp. 94-6.

<sup>2</sup> *The Philosophy of Ancient India*, p. 43.

<sup>3</sup> On the migrations of the Greek Philosophy to India, see article by M. M. Satis Chandra Vidyabhusana in JRAS., October, 1918, pp. 486-8.

the Japanese Sotoka. He has just remarked in a previous page (p. 260) that the architecture of Tibet seems to have preserved much of the mediaeval Indian style; and, quoting Fergusson,<sup>1</sup> observes that Nepāl, in its architecture, presents us with a microcosm of India as it was in the seventh century when it was visited by Hiuen Tsang. This may reasonably be taken as likely to include the figure of the Elemental Stūpa. Waddell, in the same page, has been treating of the ordinary memorial stūpa; and the juxtaposition of the different forms which a stūpa assumes appears to suggest something of the origin of the Elemental Stūpa. The memorial stūpa of India, in its origin no doubt simply a burial mound, was a monument containing relics, and remained such, although it came also frequently to be erected as an object of veneration—a pious gift—without its actually containing relics. The form developed, with additions and variations, as has been described by Fergusson and others. Assuming that the geometrical forms for the elements had otherwise become known in India, the idea might readily have suggested itself to an artist familiar with those forms to combine them in the shape of a stūpa. The idea of the five elements was already connected with that of the human body, they being at once the constituents of it and of the universe. The return of a human body to the universe might thus well be commemorated by a monument representing the five elements. The several forms assigned to the elements would lend themselves readily enough to the designing of a stūpa approaching in appearance that of the existing memorial or votive stūpa. The cubical form for earth would correspond to the rectangular base of the stūpa; the dome-shaped dhātugarbha, or relic-holder, would be represented by the globular form for water; the triangular

<sup>1</sup> See Fergusson, *History of Indian and Eastern Architecture*, revised and edited as to Indian Architecture by Burgess, 1910 ed., pp. 274-5.

pyramid, representing fire, if somewhat elongated, would stand for the tiers of umbrellas with the toran (gala or "neck") over the dome. Indeed, it is remarked in Fergusson (p. 278 of *Indian Architecture*, last edition, cited above) that the lofty spire with its thirteen discs representing chatras, or umbrellas, had, in Nepāl, been even changed into a solid cone or pyramid.<sup>1</sup> The same change will be noted in the illustrations to this paper (Figs. 5 and 6) of stūpas from Bodh Gaya. The section of the sphere,—“half-moon” (*han-getsu*), as it is called in Japan,—modifying itself into crescent form, has nothing indeed corresponding to it in the original memorial stūpa, whose apex (“tee”) was the umbrella or umbrellas; but later developments of this stūpa show additions which correspond to the section of the sphere, or crescent, and the pointed form which surmounts this and constitutes the apex in the Elemental Stūpa. I am enabled to give, in Figs. 5 and 6, representations of votive stūpas from Bodh Gaya, now in the Indian Section of the Victoria and Albert Museum, South Kensington, which exhibit strong resemblances to the memorial and votive stūpas of Nepāl, and which show, surmounting the umbrella-cone, parts corresponding to the crescent and pointed apex of the Elemental Stūpa. The best of the Bodh Gaya stūpas existing in this museum date from the sixth century, and Fig. 5 shows one of them. But as this example, unfortunately, wants the apex,—which has at one time been broken off, and is lost,—it has been found necessary to add the representation of the finial of another Bodh Gaya stūpa (Fig. 6) from the same museum, which shows the pointed apex, with the cross-piece between it and the umbrella-cone,

<sup>1</sup> To the same effect see also Hodgson's *Essays on the Language, Literature, and Religion of Nepāl and Tibet*, 1874 ed., pp. 30 and 136, note; also H. A. Oldfield, *Sketches from Nipal*, pp. 253-4 *et alibi*.



complete.<sup>1</sup> The apex here takes the form of a lotus-bud, a frequent variation which would readily occur to the Buddhist. Sometimes this apex takes a flame-like form, a not inapt representation of the fire, or light, of ethereal space. The form corresponding to the crescent not infrequently takes the shape of a vase, a lotus-flower, or an inverted vase, resembling a canopy.

It seems quite possible that the construction of the Elemental Stūpa had a reflex influence on the further development of the memorial and votive stūpas, and that, as we see in later examples of the latter (see Waddell, p. 263, and H. A. Oldfield, as quoted in note 1, p. 565), portions were added presenting the forms of the crescent and pointed apex of the Elemental Stūpa. Fig. 7,

<sup>1</sup> Examples of votive stūpas from Bodh Gaya exist in other museums in this country, but invariably, it would seem, having the apex broken off and lost.

It will be noticed that in Fig. 5 the cross-piece, immediately below where the apex has been broken off, takes the form of the *āmalaka*. This is stated by E. B. Havell (*Ancient and Medieval Architecture of India*, 1915, p. 63) to be the fruit of the blue nymphaea, which is Vishnu's ensign; and at p. 97 of the same work he gives the figure of a miniature shrine of Vishnu, found at Sarnath, crowned by the *āmalaka*; on which he remarks that "the finial, water-pot, or kalasha, is missing in most cases". The appearance of the *āmalaka* in our illustration (5) of a Buddhist stūpa from Bodh Gaya is not surprising, where monuments of different cults are to be found in close proximity. Further, Havell remarks that Buddhism seems to have gradually adopted the Vishnu symbol as a distinctive mark of the Mahāyāna school.

As regards the crescent form, both in the ordinary and in the elemental stūpa, a suggestion may be ventured that, not impossibly, its occurrence may be connected with Saivism. The stūpa was one of the early symbols of Saivism: and the crescent in the head of Siva may have in this way found a place in the finial of the ordinary stūpa. If this were so, the section of the sphere in the elemental stūpa would thus have been influenced to become a crescent, in place, as suggested in this paper, of the occurrence of the crescent in the later ordinary and miniature or votive stūpas being due to its previous occurrence in the elemental stūpa as a variation of the section of the sphere. The Japanese Dictionary of Buddhism, *Bukkyō Dai-ji-ten*, already quoted in note 1, p. 557, gives, however, the section of the sphere as the true representation of this portion of the sotoba.

from the Indian Section of the Victoria and Albert Museum, affords an example of this from South Tibet.

The form of the Elemental Stūpa travelled with Buddhism to China and Japan. So did the ordinary memorial stūpa, or dagoba, becoming what is known in China as the pagoda. But here we are concerned with the former representation only.

Variants occur even in the names of the elemental series attached to this stūpa. This, however, need not be entered into here in detail. Nor does the addition of a sixth element, which appears in Brahmanism, Buddhism, and elsewhere, concern the subject of the Elemental Stūpa.

But imagination has not been content with restricting to the series of the five elements the ideas attaching to the five symbols composing the Elemental Stūpa. On another similar figure of this stūpa, in the same picture as supplies Fig. 1, the moral analogues of the elements are enumerated as good faith, knowledge (or intelligence), propriety, uprightness, and humanity (or benevolence),—the five constant virtues according to the Chinese system. This shows that the Elemental Stūpa, which travelled, as has been said, with Buddhism to China, was adopted as a symbol for other than purely Buddhist ideas. But in the picture which supplies the illustration it may only show that the Chinese philosophy of morals was not repudiated by the Buddhists.<sup>1</sup>

In the later Buddhist system the same five forms which compose this stūpa are taken to represent the five Dhyāni Buddhas, or Buddhas of Meditation. Thus:—

<sup>1</sup> Professor H. A. Giles informs me that the figure is of common occurrence in China apart from any Buddhist surroundings.

As regards the occurrence of the Chinese Moral Series in the Buddhist picture, it may be remarked that Nukariya Kaiten, *Religion of the Samurai*, p. 230, points out that the Five Constant Virtues of Confucianism are intrinsically similar to the Five Buddhist Precepts.



represents Mahāvairocana, the Japanese Dainichi;



Aksobhya, Japanese Ashuku;



Ratnasambhava, Japanese Hōjō;



Amitābha, Japanese Amida;



Amoghasiddhi, Japanese Fukūjōjyu, a form of Sākyamuni.<sup>1</sup>

The sotoba as bearing its original symbolic meaning, indicated by the five Sanscrit words denoting the elements, is taken to belong to the natural side of things, Garbhakośa or Garbhadhātu—Japanese Tai-zō-kai—the natural universe composed of the five elements. It is then known in Japan as the Go-rin-tō, the stūpa of the five gross elements. On the spiritual side, or as belonging to the spiritual world, Vajradhātu—Japanese Kongō-kai—the sotoba has, inscribed within its five separate parts,

<sup>1</sup> An interesting parallel to the assignation of Dhyāni Buddhas to the several forms of the elements is to be found in the assignation of Deities to the elements by the Greeks. The usual arrangement is to attach the name of Hera to Earth, of Nestis, said to have been a Sicilian water-goddess, to Water, of Zeus to Fire, and of Idoneus to Air. Nestis is always associated with water, but there is some variation in the distribution of the names of the other three deities among the other three elements. (Burnet, *Early Greek Philosophy*, pp. 264-5.)

Originally the conception of the several elements as consisting of geometrical forms was, clearly, by way of a scientific explanation of the nature of those elements; the use of divine names as applied to the elements was, as indicated by Burnet, no doubt of the nature of a poetical fancy. In a similar manner it appears safe to assume that the several forms in the elemental stūpa were taken, in India, to be the actual representation of the several elements; the assignation of a Dhyāni Buddha to each of those forms was a later fanciful conception.

the five parts of the letter वँ *vaṃ*, which is the symbol of Mahāvairocana (Japanese Dai-nichi),<sup>1</sup> thus:—




FIG. 8.—The Tahō-tō, or stūpa of Prabhūtarātna.

The sotoba is then known as the Ta-hō-tō, or stūpa of Prabhūtarātna.<sup>2</sup> Thus “the constituents of Dai-nichi are five elements”. In this way it is symbolized that the

<sup>1</sup> Each of the five Dhyāni Buddhas, mentioned above, has as his symbol a letter, as have the Buddhas and Bodhisattvas generally. Thus:—

ॐ: *ah*, Divyadundubhimeghanirghoṣa, Japanese Ten-ku-rai-on-Butsu, otherwise Amoghasiddhi, Japanese Fukūjōjyu, a form of Sākyamuni.

ह: *hrīḥ*, Amitābha.

त्र: *trāḥ*, Ratnasambhava.

क्ष: *kuṣ*, Aksobhya.

वँ: *vaṃ*, Mahāvairocana.

These symbolic letters, as explained by Monier-Williams, “form the essential part of (their) mantras.”

<sup>2</sup> Prabhūtarātna, a former Buddha, in the *Saddharma Pundarīka Sūtra*. See Kern’s translation, chap. xi, in SBE., vol. xxi. See also Nanjio, *Twelve Japanese Buddhist Sects*, p. 135. With the doctrine here compare that of the Shingon sect (Nanjio, as above, pp. 78, 99, 101, and 102). See also K. Okakura, *Ideals of the East*, pp. 128 et seq.

two, that is, the natural universe and the spiritual world, "are not different in reality" (Takakusu).

The letter on the lower portion of the Koyasan sotoba (Fig. 3) is *hrīḥ* (Japanese *kirik*), the letter symbolizing Amitābha. Near this was placed the base or lower portion as of another sotoba (see Fig. 2), and on this was written the letter *trāḥ* (Japanese *tarak*), symbolizing Ratnasambhava. There are two stūpas of this form common on graves in Japan, called respectively the *kirik-tō* and the *tarak-tō*, according as one or the other of these symbolical letters is inscribed on either of them. The inscription *a-va-ra-ha-kha* on the upper portion of the respective sotobas is the same in each.<sup>1</sup>

Besides *a-va-ra-ha-kha* other variations of the formula inscribed on the sotoba are used, of which the following may be quoted here: *a-vi-ra-hum-kham* (Japanese *a-bi-ra-un-ken*), a "shingon" (mantra) or dhāraṇī sacred to Dainichi (Mahāvairocana). The formula in full is: *Namaḥ samanta-buddhānām a-vi-ra-hum-kham, Svāhā* (Japanese *Nama sam manta buddhānām a-bi-ra-un-ken, Sowaka*), meaning: To all Buddhas, earth, water, fire, air, space, hail!<sup>2</sup> The teaching thus represented implies:—

<sup>1</sup> An example of the *tarak-tō* is given in the illustration (Fig. 9) opposite this page, after a wooden sotoba on a grave at the village of Negishi, near Yokohama.

On the base of a sotoba, in stone, in the grounds of the Zen-shyu monastery, Sho-fuku-ji, near Hyogo, are inscribed the four symbolic letters *hrīḥ*, *trāḥ*, *hum*, *aḥ*, representing four of the Dhyāni Buddhas, as in note 1, p. 569.

<sup>2</sup> Professor Takakusu furnishes me with three mantras sacred to Dainichi (Mahāvairocana), the superior, middle, and inferior. The one quoted in the text, *a-vi-ra-hum-kham*, is the middle one. The superior mantra in full is: *Namaḥ samanta buddhānām, a-vuṃ-ram-ham-kham, svāhā!*, and has the same purport as the first-named one. The inferior mantra is *a-ra-pa-ṇa-na*, being the mystic collective name for the Five Dhyāni Buddhas, each being represented by a letter. (See also Monier-Williams' Dictionary, *sub voce* Arapaṇa.) The first two only of these mantras have reference to the five elements. An example, from Nepāl, of the use of the name forming the third mantra will be found in the Journ. Roy. Asiat. Soc., Oct. 1916, p. 735.




FIG. 9.—Form of the wooden soto-ba, with the inscription of the *tarak-tō*, after a soto-ba on a grave at the village of Negishi, near Yokohama.

"Man's body is composed of the five elements which go to form the universe; so the spiritual body of Dai-nichi consists of five elements. The true union of both is the highest blessing, that is Buddhahood; and the recognition of the union leads to emancipation from the circle of rebirth" (Takakusu).<sup>1</sup>

The form, in stone, of the sotoba is frequently placed near a grave, and implies that a human being has returned to the universe. There is another form, consisting simply of a long, narrow, flat board, with the shapes of the symbols of the elements cut out in it. This is placed, after the interment, in an upright position on the mound of the grave, and serves as a temporary memorial until a tombstone is erected. On it is inscribed the formula *a-ba-ra-ka-kyā*, to be read inversely *kyā-ka-ra-ba-a*.<sup>2</sup> (Fig. 9.)

<sup>1</sup> The analogy is striking between this doctrine and the teaching in the Upanishads, where Brahman is said to dwell in the water, fire, ether, wind, sun, moon, and stars, the regions of the earth, etc., and that the same is the inner self of man. (See Garbe, *Philosophy of Ancient India*, pp. 70 et seq.) If we compare the notion, such as was in vogue among the Greek philosophers, of Space, or the Fifth Element, "which embraces all the others," "permeating" the four elements, or being "inhaled" by them, we may possibly have a reason of the Fifth Element being selected as the representative of Mahāvairocana, "whose constituents are the five."


<sup>2</sup> The form given in Fig. 3 was probably kept in the temple there referred to as a model for those to be placed on graves.

The letters in Fig. 9 are represented, as nearly as possible, as they stood on the sotoba.

ADDITIONAL NOTE.—The form which constitutes the apex of the sotoba is often, in Japan, termed the *Nyo-i*. The *Nyo-i* is properly the staff in the hands of the Buddhist priesthood,—originally, probably, a club for defence, or offence; and then a mace. If the flame-like terminal of the apex of the sotoba is bent over towards one side, the apex assumes a certain resemblance to this mace or staff. The term *Nyo-i* (如意) means "according to desire",—"as you wish".









1




2




3




4



5



6



7

THE JAPANESE SOTOBA.

## EXPLANATION OF PLATE

- FIG. 1.—The Sotoba. From a Japanese Buddhist picture of Mount Sumēru (Mēru).
- „ 2.—Base of the *tarak-tō*.
- „ 3.—Form, in wood, of the Sotoba, from Koyasan, Japan; the *kirik-tō*.
- „ 4.—Figure from the Mosque Ganj-e-sayed, at Benares, resembling the Elemental Stūpa.
- „ 5.—Votive stūpa, in granulite, from Bodh Gaya. Sixth century. Apex wanting. Now in the Indian Section, Victoria and Albert Museum, South Kensington. Reproduced, by permission, from a photograph kindly supplied from the Museum. Before reproduction the illustration was reduced in size.
- „ 6.—Finial of votive stūpa from Bodh Gaya; showing the apex. Sixth century. Now in the Indian Section, Victoria and Albert Museum, South Kensington. Reproduced, by permission, from a photograph from the Museum, and reduced in size.
- „ 7.—Miniature stūpa (*ch'orten*), or reliquary, of cast brass, inset with turquoises; containing small prayer-rolls. From Gyantse District, South Tibet. Nineteenth century. Now in the Indian Section, Victoria and Albert Museum, South Kensington. Reproduced by permission.
-



# XVIII

## THE LEGEND OF THE DIVINE LOVERS: ENLIL AND NINLIL

By THEOPHILUS G. PINCHES

THE following is a transcription and translation of the reverse of the British Museum Tablet the text of which is given on p. 191. The whole legend, as far as known, is printed on pp. 185-205 from Professor Stephen Langdon's rendering.

1. . . . .
2. Mina ni-in- . . . . .  
Ditto hath . . . . .
3. <sup>a</sup>. Nam-tar-ra . . . . .
4. i-lum mu-šim si- . . . . .  
The god deciding the fa[te?] . . . . .
5. <sup>a</sup>. En-lil ki-ur-ra . . . . .
6. mina i-na mina u-ša-ḥa-zu u(?)- . . . . .  
Enlil in the palace causeth to take . . . . .
7. <sup>a</sup>. En-lil u-su-e [uru-ta ba-ra-ê.]
8. mina mu-su-uq-qu i-na a-li li-ši.  
Enlil, may the impure go forth from the city.
9. <sup>a</sup>. Nu-nam-nir u-su-e uru-ta ba-ra-[ê.]
10. mina mu-su-uq-qu i-na a-li li-ši.  
Nu-namnir, may the impure go forth from the city.
11. <sup>a</sup>. En-lil nig-nam-ma nam-mu-un-tar-ra-šu.
12. mina a-na šim-ti ša ta-ši-mu.  
Enlil, for the fate which thou hast fixed.
13. <sup>a</sup>. Nu-nam-nir nam-ma nam-mu-un-tar-ra-šu.
14. mina a-na šim-ti ša ta-ši-mu.  
Nu-namnir, for the fate which thou hast fixed.
15. <sup>a</sup>. En-lil ni-ira <sup>a</sup>. Nin-[lil ni]-uš.
16. mina il-la-ak mina i-ri-id-di.  
Enlil cometh, Ninlil followeth after.

17. <sup>a</sup>. Nu-nam-nir ni-ira. šar-ra.  
 18.           mina mina mina-u.  
           (Read Nu-namnir ni-ira šarru.)  
           Nu-namnir cometh, the king.  
 19. <sup>a</sup>. En-lil-li mulu ka-gal-la-dim gu-mu-un-na-an-de-e.  
 20.           mina mina a-na ša mina    i-še-si.  
           (Read Enlilli ana ša ka-galla išesi.)  
           Enlil to the man of *ka-gulla* speaketh :  
 21. Mulu ka-gala-am                           mulu giš si-gar-ra.  
 22.           Ša mina ša mina.  
           (Read ša ka-gala ša sigari.)  
           Man of the great gate, man of the bar ;  
 23. Mulu giš šu-di-eš-am           mulu giš si-[gar] azag-ga.  
 24.           ša me-di-li ša si-ga-ri [el-li.]  
           Man of the lock, man of the holy bar ;  
 25. Nina-zu <sup>a</sup>. Nin-lil-li i-im-ira.  
 26.           be-lit-ka mina il-la-ka.  
           Thy lady, Ninlil, cometh.  
 27. Ud-da li-mu. mu-ra [tar]-ra  
 28.           Šu-um-ma a-na šu-mi-ia i-ša-il-ka.  
           If for my name (any man) ask thee.  
 29. Za-e ki-mu nu-mu-un-bil-bil.  
 30.           At-ta āš-ri la tu-kal-lam-šu.  
           Thou shalt not reveal my place to him.  
 31. <sup>a</sup>. En-lil-li mulu ka-gala-dim gu-mu-un-na-an-de-e.  
 32.           mina mina a-na ša mina i-še-si.  
           (Read Enlilli ana ša ka-gala išesi.)  
           Enlil to the man of *ka-gala* speaketh :  
 33. Mulu ka-gala-am                           mulu giš si-[gar]-ra  
 34.           Ša mina ša mina.  
           (Read Ša kagala, ša sigari.)  
           Man of the great gate, man of the bar ;  
 35. Mu-lu giš šu-di-eš-am           mu-lu giš si-gar azag-ga.  
           (Read in Akkadian : Ša medili, ša sigari êlli.)  
           Man of the lock, man of the holy bar.  
 36. Nin-zu <sup>a</sup>. Nin-lil-li i-im-ira.

37. be-lit-ka mina il-la-ka.  
Thy lady, Ninlil, cometh.
38. mulu Ki-el ne-en šag-ga-ra ne-en mul-la-ra.
39. ar-da-tu ša ki-a-am dam-qat ki-a-am  
ba-na-a-at.  
The handmaid who is so gracious, so brilliant.
40. Mulu giš-na-e-dug mulu im-su-ub-[su-ub]-ba.
41. Man-ma-an aya-ir-ḫi-e-ši man-ma-an aya-  
iš-ši-iq-ši.  
Let no one court her, let no one kiss her.
42. <sup>a</sup>.Nin-lil ne-en šag-ga-ra ne-en mul-la-ri.
43. Mīna ki-a-am dam-qat ki-a-am ba-na-tu  
Ninlil so gracious, so brilliant.
- 
44. <sup>a</sup>.En-lil-li šag-ga šag-ga bar-ra mu-un-da-ab-dug  
Enlil pleasant things in secret spake with her.
- 
45. giš Li'um maḫru-u Dur-an ki eri-na-nam nu-al-til-[la]  
First tablet: "In Dur-ana, their city." Incomplete.
46. Kima labiri-šu ša-ṭi-ir. Dup-pi m.d. Šamaš-na- . . .  
Written like its original. Tablet of Šamaš-na- . . .

## NOTES

As about 1,300 years separates the Museum-copy from that used by Professor Langdon, it is only natural that there should be differences in the two texts. Comparatively few variants, however, seem to have crept into the legend in this long interval, and the departures from the earlier text are probably due to some scribe who, in that period, regarded the poem as capable of improvement. Probably the most important of these variants is that represented by l. 17, which corresponds with l. 27 on p. 193. In the latter Professor Langdon's text reads "Nu-namnir cometh, the handmaid (Ninlil) followeth" (*kiel mun[šurra]*), but the later copy (that of the British Museum) reads "Nu-namnir cometh, the king", as I have rendered it. The variant reading is indicated in the usual way, by "dittoing" the words of the Sumerian line, and in this

case we have three signs of repetition, followed by a phonetic ending, namely,  $\Pi \Pi \Pi \text{𒀭}$ . Now, my copy (which, unfortunately, I have been unable to revise) has, in the Sumerian line, simply the words *Nu-namnir ni-ira, šarra*. In the ordinary way, this would become simply, in Akkadian (i.e. the Semitic version), *Nu-namnir ni-ira šarru*. We have to admit, however, for the second  $\Pi$ , the Akkadian rendering of these words in l. 16, namely, *il-la-ak*, "he cometh," but the remaining repetition-signs,  $\Pi \text{𒀭}$ , cannot repeat *i-ri-id-di* (read  $\text{𒀭}$  for  $\text{𒀭}$ ), as that would necessitate, in the preceding Sumerian line, not *šur-ra*, which the text gives, but *ni-uš*, as in l. 15, completed in accordance with p. 193, l. 26.


The traces of the first two characters of the first visible line lend themselves to the reading in the older copy, namely, *Dingir* (dialectic *Dimmer*) *galgala*, the remainder of the line being, as indicated on p. 193, *ninnū-nene*, "the great gods, fifty they," or "the 50 great gods". This suggests that the completion of the Semitic rendering should be *ilāni rabūti ḥamšaya šunu*, but my copy of the traces visible does not lend itself to this.

The third line, however, is more satisfactory, and must have read like line 22 on p. 193, namely, *Dingir* (or *Dimmer*) *namtarra iminna-nene*, "The seven gods of fate." The Semitic rendering of this, as far as preserved, is *Ilu<sup>m</sup> mušim si-*. Here, again, there would seem to be something wrong, for the complete rendering should be *ilāni mušim šimāti sibitti šunu*, "The gods fixing the fates, seven are they." Of course it is possible that *ilu<sup>m</sup>* may be construed as a plural, the grammatical number being indicated by the lengthened end-vowel or immutation, but if my copy be correct *šimāti* is omitted.


In line 5 the Sumerian of *ušāhazu* (line 6) is *immanituggane* (p. 193, line 23). The root is *tuga*, "to have" or "to be". As *ušāhazu* (root *ahāzu*, "to have") is


causative, the Sumerian equivalent must also have that force.

For *u-su-e* in lines 7 and 9 the older text has *u-sug-gi*. In *W. Asia Inscr.*, vol. v, pl. 42, line 26e, *u-su* or *u-suga* is rendered in Semitic by the borrowed form *usukku*. In this the final syllable, *ga* (in the older copy of this legend *ggi*) becomes *kku*—a change of which there are many examples. In *W. Asia Inscr.* *usuga* is preceded by *ki-el-tur*, Semitic *batultu*<sup>m</sup>, "young handmaid," "virgin," or the like, and followed by *kar-lil*, Sem. *harimtu*, "votary of Ištar," "prostitute." After this, we have words meaning "secret thing" or "act", "wet nurse", and "matron", or the like, the last being represented by two Sumerian groups. Male devotee of Ištar, the goddess of sexual love, is probably the meaning of *usue*. Whether *mausuggu* be a doublet of *usukku*, from the same Sumerian word, or not, remains to be seen.

The character resembling , at the end of line 10, is probably due to a slip of the Babylonian scribe.

In lines 11 and 13 the Sumerian for "to fix the fate" is given, and, as will be seen, it is *numma nam-turra*, "augury augury to decide." The ideograph of the noun-element, in the Sumerian line-form, is the picture of a bird, generally regarded as a swallow. Deciding a thing by means of the flight of birds would seem, therefore, to have been as old as the Babylonian script itself.

The end of line 15 in my copy is defective. The new text (p. 195) shows that it should be completed  
 <sup>a</sup>. *Nin-lil ni-uš*.

Generally the sign of repetition, , indicates that the Sumerian word is transferred (either as it stands, or with a Semitic termination) to the Semitic line. In line 18, however, this can hardly be intended in the case of the Sumerian *ni-du* or *ni-ira*, and the dittoed word is undoubtedly the *il-la-ak* in line 16. This makes it possible that *mulu ka-galla*, in lines 19 and 21, should



be read, in Semitic, *ša abulli*, as on p. 193. It is to be noted, however, that *ša abulli* does not appear in line 20, as would in that case be expected.

The reading of the name of the goddess of the Underworld as *Ereš-ki-gal* instead of *Nin-ki-gal* suggests the possible reading *ereš-zu* in line 26. But in the dialect of Sumerian another word for "lady", namely, *gašan*, was used, and this may be the equivalent intended here.

In lines 27-28 we see that the Sumerian *tarra* has the meaning of "to ask" (the completion is from *Cuneiform Texts*, xii, 15, 16, 32b). From this it would seem that the name of the ruler of Lagaš, *En-li-tar-zi*, means "the lord who asked for life", or the like, *li-tar* being apparently the full idiomatic expression.

The absence of the negative in the second half of l. 40 (if my copy be correct) is noteworthy, and the most probable explanation is that *na*, "not," "may it not," in the first half of the line, governs *im-subsubba* in the second half, and this notwithstanding that it could have been added without increasing the number of the syllables, if the final *m* had been omitted, making *nam-subsubba*. But perhaps this would have been inelegant or unharmonious. In any case, we may suppose that the form needed would have been *nam-munsubsubba*, and this would have necessitated the use of a corresponding form (*gis-nam-edug*) in the first half.

Naturally there are many problems in a text like this, and it is to be hoped that an Assyrian copy may result from the excavations being made, or to be made, in Babylonia and Assyria in the near future.

Line 44 is the catch-line of the next tablet.

---

## MISCELLANEOUS COMMUNICATIONS

### SATIYAPUTRA OF THE ASOKA EDICTS

On pp. 541-2 of the Journal for 1918 Mr. Venkaṭēś-varaiyar draws attention to the fact that the identification of Satiyaputra in the second Rock-Edict of Asoka remains unsatisfactory, and offers what obviously he considers a more satisfactory identification by making Satiyaputa equivalent to Satyavrata Kṣētra, the ceremonial designation of Kānchī or Conjivaram.

First of all, the term Satyavrata-kṣētra is applied to the town Kānchī, or more strictly, only to a part of it, and not to the country dependent upon it. This latter is known as Drāviḍa or Tundīra, according to the period of history. In the earliest Tamil literature, some of which may reach up to the age of Patañjali, Tonḍanāḍu seems to be the name given to it; of course, the name *Satyavrata Kṣētra* cannot be looked for in that class of works.

In five out of the six available versions of this edict (the exception being Dhauli) this term occurs. In three of them (Kālsī, Girnar, and Jaugaḍa) the form is *Satiyaputa*. In the two others (Shāhbaz-garhi and Mansera) it is *Satiyaputra*.<sup>1</sup> The northern texts preserve the letter *r*. The first part of the word is generally taken to be *Satya*. I should like to raise the question whether it could not be regarded (even as an Apabhramśa form) as a derivative from *Satī* (chaste wife). It seems to me to be a Kannaḍa Apabhramśa, meaning "children of women who are peculiarly *Satī*" (chaste) with reference to the prevalent matriarchate where widowhood is impossible. This seems possible, as we know that Kannaḍa as a distinct language may reach back to Patañjali's age.<sup>2</sup> The term may also

<sup>1</sup> Vide Rāmāvatāra Sarma's *Piyadasi Inscriptions*, pp. 3, 4, variant readings at the end.

<sup>2</sup> Hultzsch in J. R. A. S., 1904, pp. 399 et seq.

be taken as referring to the worship of Satī (Durgā), which I understand is common among all the Nāyar Tarawāḍs.

Whatever may be the ultimate etymological interpretation of the word, its context has reference to a people, directly, as in the case of the Choḷas, Pāṇḍyas, or Kēraḷas, or indirectly by reference to the country, as in the case of Tambapanni (supposed by some writers to mean Ceylon). *Satyavrata* as the name of a country is, I believe, unknown. There is, besides, the point whether the part *vrata* could become *puta*, or *putra*.

*Sātputé* is certainly closer to *Satiyaṇutra*, and Sir R. G. Bhandarkar's location seems quite probable, as we have the Morve or More (Moriya or Maurya), in about the same locality, perhaps farther south.

Kāñchī or Kāñchīpura, as a town, figures prominently in literature, both early Tamil and Sanskrit; but I have not come across any reference to the country by that name. In the centuries on either side of the Christian Era, Kāñchī was not an independent capital of any kingdom.<sup>1</sup> There were tribes of people, each with its organization, and in that period even Tirupati, called Vēṅgaḍam, was the capital of a chieftain. Kāñchī emerges into political importance with the Pallavas. The Toṇḍamān chieftain, Iḷam Tirayan, is no doubt identified with Kāñchī; but he was only a Choḷa feudatory.

In the age preceding the rise of the Pallavas Kāñchī was an important town; but the tribes had not yet achieved a distinct political individuality so as to be counted separately.<sup>2</sup> It is also quite likely that these were subordinate to the Choḷas. On the west coast the earliest available evidence in Tamil literature refers to

<sup>1</sup> As *Kacchi*, the capital of the Toṇḍamān Ilandirayan. *Perumbāṇā-ṇṇuppaḍai*, i, 420.

<sup>2</sup> Vēṅgaḍam is referred to as belonging to Tirayār in poem 85, and to Toṇḍaiyar in poem 281 of the Aham 400.

the Tuḷu *Nāḍu* as a distinct political and ethnic entity immediately to the north of the Chera or Kēraḷa. The Tuḷu country then took in a part of what is now North Malabar, and probably extended northwards to Karwar Point, the beginning of the Tamil coast according to the classical geographers. In the days of the Vijayanagar Empire the Tuḷu country was divided into two divisions with capitals at Barakur and Mangalore, which latter, according to the Portuguese historian Barros, was the limit of Malabar. This, however, is not much of evidence for the period relating to the Edicts of Asoka. If the Strī-rājya of the Purāṇas came close upon the Mūṣika country in the west of Kalinga and Kosala as the Hāthīgumphā Inscription states,<sup>1</sup> it is just as likely that this tribe, or these tribes, extended southwards indefinitely along the Western Ghāts, as no country or people is mentioned either in the Asoka Edicts or in the Purāṇas, between these and the Rāshṭrikas and Pīṭṇikas.

In Sanskrit literature generally the part of the country dominated by Kāñchī seems to be uniformly known as Drāviḍa. A more primitive name, so far as I am able to trace it in Sanskrit literature, is the term Aṭavika, the exact equivalent of Kāḍava, which came to be used as a synonym of the Pallava tribes in various localities during the historical period. I have not found this name in the so-called Sangam literature; but it seems to be a fairly common designation for the Pallavas in the literature of the period immediately following the age of the Sangam. If, therefore, we should expect a name in the Asoka Edicts for this region, it is very unlikely it should have made any approach to *Satyavrata* at all.

<sup>1</sup> J.B. & O.R.S., iii, 1917, p. 442. The Strīrājya is associated with the Mūṣika country in the Vishnu Purāṇa (Wilson, iv, p. 221). The southern texts have *Trairājya* for *Strīrājya*. Both are referred to as *Janapadān*, not necessarily republican in constitution. Mr. Jayaswal would equate Satiyaputra with Sātavāhana in note 24. The Mūṣikas were in Travancore in the twelfth century and later.

Drāviḍa or Tuṇḍira (Sanskritized form of the Tamil Tonḍayar) would be the more likely name for the particular region rather than the sacerdotal, and obviously later Brahmanical designation *Satyavrata*, which at best, in orthodox usage, designates merely the town of Kāñchi without any reference whatever to the country dependent on it.

It seems more likely, therefore, that these Satiyaputras were a Western people, and have to be looked for between the Kēraḷas and the Rāshṭrikas along the western hills, and that it is likely that the Sātputé are their modern representatives. If so, could it not be the collective name of the various matriarchal communities like the Tuḷus and the Nāyars of the Malabar and Kanara districts of to-day?<sup>1</sup>

S. KRISHNASWAMI AIYANGAR.

---

#### ETHNOLOGY OF THE PHILIPPINES

A paper on this subject has been received from Dr. Lobingier, Judge of the United States Court for China at Shanghai, which the Society is unable to publish *in extenso*, but of which, with the author's consent, the following brief abstract has been prepared.<sup>2</sup>

<sup>1</sup> I agree that no substantial reason exists for identifying Satiyaputra with Kāñchi. The Satiyaputras must have adjoined Keraḷa. I am now convinced that Satiyaputra should be identified with the Satyamaṅgalam Tālūk in Coimbatore, as mentioned in my review of *The Beginnings of South Indian History*, printed in this number. That identification in no way conflicts with the observation of D. R. Bhandarkar that Sātputē "is a surname current among the present Marāṭhās". He suggests that the Sātputēs may have emigrated to Mahārāṣṭra from their original seat near the western coast to the south. Satyamaṅgalam adjoins Coorg in the Western Ghāts, and was formerly an important strategical position, with mines of beryl and corundum. See *Ind. Ant.*, vol. xxxiv, p. 250 (1905).—V. A. S.

<sup>2</sup> The paper has since been printed in full in the Journal of the North China Branch of the Royal Asiatic Society, vol. L, 1919. It contains, in the notes, a valuable list of bibliographical references.

*Title.*—The Early Malays and their Neighbours: a Brief Survey of Primitive Cultural Influence affecting the Filipinos. (With an incidental review of the Philippine Academy's work.) By Charles Sumner Lobingier, Ph.D., D.C.L., Chancellor of the Academy, 1909-14, now Chancellor Emeritus.

*Philippine Academy.*—The Philippine Academy was organized in 1909 and incorporated under the laws of the archipelago in 1910 for "the promotion of advanced research in subjects pertaining to Filipinology, to effect a union of scholars and investigators interested therein, to aid in the establishment of a complete and consolidated library of 'Filipiniana', to encourage the preparation and publication of scientific treatises thereon, to provide uniform standards and devise improved methods in conducting such investigations, and to co-operate with scientific organizations elsewhere". For some few years past much valuable work has been done in this branch of research, particularly in the investigation of the period preceding the Spanish conquest of the Philippines.

*Malay Origins and Contact with Negritos.*—Much attention has been devoted to the origin of the Indonesian races, with particular reference to the important Sanskritic element which is apparent in many of their languages, and to their contact and mixture in the Philippines with the Negritos, who seem to have been the earliest inhabitants of that island group. The works of research on local ethnology are numerous and of great interest, deserving to be better known than they are at present.

*Northward Migration.*—The view is expressed that the Indonesians, who undoubtedly exist in Formosa, also spread to Japan and even to Korea.

*Chinese Influence.*—It is shown that the relations of the Chinese with the Philippines go back to a distant date, and it is argued that they have not been without influence on the social customs of the islanders. Instances

adduced include veneration for old age, respect for graves, and certain marriage customs, in which it is claimed that Chinese influence is discernible.

*Arab Influence.*—Muhammadian influence also played its part. At present it is prevalent only in the southern portion of the Philippine group, but when the Spaniards arrived at the Pasig River they found a Muhammadan prince reigning in Tondo, now a part of Manila, and Islam quite extensively established there. So far as the northern and central islands are concerned, the Spaniards succeeded in wiping it out, but the southern Philippines are Muhammadan to this day. Islam has imported much of its law into the customary law of the natives, and this has received official recognition at the hands of the American authorities.

The paper concludes with a plea for the wider recognition of the Philippine Academy and the good work which it has done and is still doing. The hope is expressed that there may be a closer acquaintance between it and our own Society, which claims to be interested in every corner of Asia. It is plain that where there has been so much intermixture of cultural influences, the complex problems resulting therefrom can only be solved by collaboration and exchange of information.

C. O. BLAGDEN.

---

#### THE DATE OF THE BOOK OF JOB

The above problem is one of great interest to literature as well as archæology, so may I suggest another guide to the solution of the question other than that proposed by Mr. Beveridge in his interesting article on p. 234 of the April Journal.

I refer to the possible, not to say probable, mention of pyramids in Job iii, 14. The sentence runs: “. . . then had I been at rest with kings and counsellors of the earth

which built desolate places for themselves." It is difficult to grasp the meaning of "building a desolate place", and the revisers of 1884 seem to have tried to get over the difficulty by rendering it "built up waste places", which makes better sense, though it is foreign to the thought of the whole chapter.

The Arabic version gives the word *alram*, pyramids, in lieu of desolate places. The Russian Bible also renders it pyramids, and in our own Revised Version we have as an alternative reading in the margin "built solitary piles".

This rendering of the words "desolate places" as "pyramids" makes the verse fall into line with the thought of the whole chapter, where Job is longing for a sort of Buddhist *nirvana*, and one of the similes used is the eternal rest and freedom from disturbance which no doubt the pyramid builders expected would be their lot. The mighty structures raised in Egypt doubtless were the talk of the whole earth, and what more natural than that Job should allude to them as types of the dwelling-place of eternal rest. A few hundred years later it was found, and generally known, that even the pyramids were not secure from robbers, official and unofficial, and so the "kings and counsellors of the earth" devised other means, such as the pit under the *mastaba*, or the rock-cut tunnel with the hidden entrance as at Thebes, to preserve their mummies for eternity.

If this surmise is correct, it narrows down the possible date of Job to a very small margin, namely, the generations immediately following the era of the pyramid builders, for it is obvious it could not have been written before the pyramids were built, and if a much later date is assigned, when it was common knowledge that the pyramids were not secure resting-places, the allusion is meaningless.

VICTOR L. TRUMPER.



## GRAVES OF EUROPEANS AT ISFAHAN

In JRAS. for July, 1919, the Greek epitaph on p. 334 does not need the proposed emendation, τῆς πόλεως. The phrase ἐκ τῆς βασιλεβουση[ς] τῶν πόλεων means "from the Queen of Cities", i.e. "Imperial City". The personal name Thymianos, though rare, is still in use among the Greeks of Asia Minor.

JOHN L. MYRES.

## "ANGLO-INDIANS"

With reference to the note in JRAS, 1919, p. 62, pointing out that the use of the term "Anglo-Indian" to designate the community of mixed European and Indian blood can be traced back to 1826 in the time of Sir John Malcolm, and is not a perverse innovation of Lord Hardinge of Penshurst, as commonly supposed, Dr. H. W. B. Moreno, Ph.D., M.R.A.S., writes enumerating the various alternative designations. From about 1800 the term "East Indian" was in common use. It was succeeded by "Eurasian", and the suggested substitute "Eurindian" failed to secure currency. The official adoption of "Anglo-Indian" in Sir John Malcolm's sense by Lord Hardinge's Government was decreed in response to a petition from the community immediately concerned.

Dr. Moreno concludes by observing that "the Anglo-Indian community has, however, received a nomenclature for the present, and unless a stricter classification of terms is devised, it will continue to adopt what is generally accepted by one and all acquainted with India and its doings".

A LADIES' COLLEGE IN CAPPADOCIA IN THE THIRD  
MILLENNIUM B.C.

From time to time I have contributed to the French Assyriological Journal *Babyloniaca* copies and translations

of cuneiform tablets found at Kara Enyuk, 5 kilometres north-east of Kaisariyeh in the ancient Cappadocia. They belong to the period of the Third Dynasty of Ur, as we now know from a dating on one of them published by M. Thureau-Dangin, and show that all the elements of Babylonian culture had already been introduced into Eastern Asia Minor. Postal messengers traversed the roads carrying letters from one part of the country to the other, a species of cheque was used, though the written material was clay instead of paper, and the silver, lead, and copper mines were extensively worked. In fact, it was on account of these mines that Assyro-Babylonian colonies had originally been established in that part of the world, and an active trade was carried on. We hear a good deal in the letters about the "commercial traveller" (*damgaru*).

The language of the letters is an Assyrian dialect, much influenced by the surrounding Asianic languages from which many words were borrowed. In other ways, also, the colonies were Asianic rather than Babylonian. They used a week of five days, their constitution was republican and not monarchical, and the women occupied a foremost place in them. Tablets in the Philadelphia Museum which I copied three years ago inform us that by the side of the "Prince" or "President" of the district and the "Prefect" of the city stood the "Princess" and the "Prefectess", who seem to have enjoyed equal rights with their male coadjutors.

And now a tablet has turned up which proves that a ladies' University or College must have existed among them. Dr. G. Contenau has just published thirty tablets belonging to himself which must have formed part of the large collection—about 2,000 according to the information I received—discovered by the natives a few months before the War. One of these, No. ix, is of exceptional interest. The signification of the important part of it has escaped

Dr. Contenau, who has accordingly left it untranslated, though he has perceived that the word *sinin*, which follows the proper names Akirim and Gagia, must signify "Intendant" or something similar.

Here is a translation of the tablet:—

*Obv.*

1.  $\frac{2}{3}$  *siklu* XV SE *a-na*  
Two-thirds of a shekel, 15 grains for
2. *bit-khar-ri*  $\frac{1}{3}$  *siklu* VII SE  
the ox-stall,  $\frac{1}{3}$  of a shekel, 7 grains
3. *A-ki-ri-im* *si-ni-in*  
(from ?) Akiru professor
4. *sa gi-ni-es-tim*  
of the University
5. *a-na u-ti-tim*  
for letters
6. *i-na a-al SAL-at*  
in the women's city,
7. *Ga-gi-a si-ni-in*  
(from ?) Gagia Professor
8. *rabu a-na u-mat-tim*  
in chief for arts
9. *i-na Al-za-na*  
in Alzana;

*Rev.*

10. *V siklu* I-ti-Za-bu-um  
5 shekels (from ?) Iti-Zabum,
11. *III siklu* U-?-sa-Istar  
3 shekels (from ?) U . . sa-Istar,
12. *II siklu* Kha-na-a  
2 shekels (from ?) Khand,
13. *III siklu* Dan-A-sir  
3 shekels (from ?) Dan-Asir,

14. *II siklu* *Su-ma-li-bi-A-sur*  
 2 shekels (from ?) Suma-libi-Asur,  
 15. *I siklu* *A-sur-dhabu*  
 1 shekel (from ?) Asur-dhabu  
 16. *ši-ma-la-i-um*  
 the apprentice,  
 17. *I siklu* *A-da-da DUP-SAR*  
 1 shekel (from ?) Adada the scribe.

*Ginestim* is the Assyrian *kinistum*, "a University." *Utitim* is, as elsewhere in these tablets, the Babylonian *waditim* or *wadatim*, "knowledge," from *wadû*, "to know," and *umattim* is the Assyrian *ummatu*, "arts and crafts." *Sinin* has the same root as the Heb. *sunnâh*, "instruction" (in Kiryath-Sannah), Arabic *sunnah*. *Gagia* was *sinin rabu*, "chief Professor" or "Head" of the College of Arts. It is interesting to find that the University was divided into the two Colleges of Letters and Arts, the latter of which included crafts. As for *šimalaium* in line 16, Dr. Contenau compares it with the Assyrian *samallu*, "tradesman," but it is evidently the Talmudic *sewaleyâ*, "apprentice." *Alzana* appears to be the proper name of the "Women's city" (*al Zinnisât*), but it may represent *Al-zana*, "the city of Zana." It is a mere coincidence, however, that *Zana* means "goddess" in Elamite.

A. H. SAYCE.

---

#### ADDENDUM TO PAGE 167, APRIL, 1919

The abbreviation at the end of Poem VI should no doubt read בילאו חושלבע, being the well-known concluding phrase ברוך י' לעולם אמן ואמן. תהלה ושבה לאל בורא עולם.

JACOB MANN.

---



## NOTICES OF BOOKS

---

BAR HEBRÆUS'S BOOK OF THE DOVE, TOGETHER WITH SOME CHAPTERS FROM HIS ETHIKON. Translated by A. J. WENSINCK. With an Introduction, Notes, and Registers. pp. cxxxvi + 152. Printed for the Trustees of the "De Goeje Fund", No. IV. Leyden: E. J. Brill. 1919.

Abul Faradj Gregory, surnamed Bar Hebræus, being the son of the Jewish physician Aaron, was, in the words of Wright, "one of the most learned and versatile men that Syria ever produced," great as philosopher, physician, astronomer, historian, and theologian, and also as Bible commentator and grammarian. His chief aim seemed to have been to bring to the Syrians the knowledge accumulated by the Arabs, and many of his works, in fact most of them, were either direct translations or close adaptations of the Arabic writers. It is interesting to watch the stages through which his learning and activity passed. He started with philosophy and finished practically with mysticism. He started with Avicenna and finished with Ghazali. To the influence of the latter we owe now what probably may have been the last books written by the famous Jacobite Mafrian, Bar Hebræus, who flourished in the middle and end of the thirteenth century, the *Ethikon* and the *Book of the Dove*. Of the former Assemani had already given a complete description of its contents, but the text had not been published until quite recently, by Bedjan, who also included in his publication the *Book of the Dove*. Professor Wensinck has now given us an excellent translation of the latter, together with some chapters of the *Ethikon*. He has undertaken the work, as he

writes, "for the purpose of making the sources of Syriac mysticism more accessible, for its sake, and also because of its intimate connection with Muslim mysticism from its origin up to Ghazali," for he is not satisfied only with giving us a faithful rendering, but he adds to it a careful investigation into the sources of these two books; of which the former is a general guide to pure life, whilst the latter, the *Book of the Dove*, is a manual for the solitary recluse.

Professor Wensinck gives a full analysis of the contents of these books and of the system of mystical contemplation contained in the *Book of the Dove*. He shows that the mystic has to pass through various stages, purification of the soul, elimination of all the affections, a complete immersion in the Divine, which is described as Love, and finally reaches the Gnosis, different from the ancient Gnostic speculation and stripped of all the magical ceremonies and astral beliefs which had been mixed up with it. Even the love becomes here esoteric, and Bar Hebræus, like other mystics, does not scruple to use erotic terms to denote the connexion between the mystic and the Divine. The process is continued until by a revelation the glorious splendour of the Divine is made manifest to the purified soul lifted up in ecstasy. This knowledge and this ecstasy are not obtained by learning, or by logical argument or philosophic speculations, but are granted to a few by a spiritual elevation, or rather by a revelation for which man prepares himself in the manner described. In it neither dogmas nor prayer find any place. All this Bar Hebræus took mostly from Ghazali, though, as the author shows in the introduction, he is also greatly indebted to some Syriac and Greek writers like Isak of Nineve, Hieroteus, Dionysius the Areopagite, and others, among them being some Arabic writers. Considering that Ghazali has often reproduced literally the words of the authors whom he quotes, it is

not unlikely that, having been taken over by Bar Hebræus, they may lead to the belief that the latter has excerpted them from those older authors directly. But Professor Wensinck goes further; he endeavours to trace the sources of these mystical speculations among the Arabs higher up, first to Syriac writers, and then to that vast literature of mystical speculation which embraces the Semitic nations of the East, and which he calls Hellenistic. No doubt the ancient mysteries had not died out, and the very central principle, that of "knowing the Divine", granted to the "illuminated" by the Divine light and splendour, is the common property of all schools and systems of mysticism, but a large gap separates the ancient mysteries from this mysticism at the end of the thirteenth century.

It is therefore surprising that Professor Wensinck should have concentrated his attention only upon some Greek mystical traditions, or rather ancient mysteries, preserved in the Greek tongue, but not of Greek origin, in spite of Plotinus and the Neo-Platonists (in these systems only the language is Greek), and that he should have passed over the religious system of the Mandeans, whose name denotes the men of the "Knowledge or Gnosis", and whose chief book, *The Genza*, is the "Treasury of Light". Above all it is surprising that he should have ignored so completely the mystical or cabalistic literature of the Jews. It flourished in Palestine and in Syria. We find already in the mystical Targum to the Song of Songs that esoteric love and this mystical and allegorical interpretation was adopted by the Church at a very early age. We find it still more fully elaborated in that vast mystical literature of the Zohar, the splendour Divine, whose pages are diffused with those "rays of light which run through the scripture", as Bar Hebræus puts it, and which literature in a somewhat incoherent form gives the mystical speculations of various recluses who lived



their solitary life in Divine immersion. The investigation of Professor Wensinck would have been more fruitful in positive results had he turned his attention also to this more immediate source of mystical inspiration among the Jewish schools in Babylon and Palestine. Most of these books, moreover, are written in the Aramaic language closely akin to the Syriac, with which Bar Hebræus was unquestionably quite familiar. Yet, despite this drawback, the work of Professor Wensinck deserves very high commendation for the care and accuracy of workmanship, for the excellent rendering, and for the very scholarly and lucid introduction which in itself forms a valuable contribution to the history of mysticism in Syria in the thirteenth century.

As it is a book which, by its very nature, appeals only to a limited circle of students, the Trustees of the De Goeje Fund may also be thanked for having granted the means for the publication of this work.

M. GASTER.

---

THE BEGINNINGS OF SOUTH INDIAN HISTORY. By Professor S. KRISHNASWAMI AIYANGAR. Madras: The Modern Printing Works, 1918. Price 5s. net or rupees 3.12.

In this work the industrious Madras Professor of Indian History and Archæology carries further his studies in the historical contents of Tamil literature which he published in 1911 under the title *Ancient India*. The work of the late V. Kanaka-sabhai entitled *The Tamils Eighteen Hundred Years Ago* (Madras, Higginbotham, 1904), now out of print, was the pioneer treatise on the subject. It is a pity that the Professor does not attend more closely to the form of his books. The work now noticed has been hastily and carelessly printed without proper press corrections. Pages 209 and 210 are repeated,

as are pp. 223 and 224. Pages 211 and 212 are missing, as well as pp. 221 and 222, and other pages are misplaced. The long list of errata is far from complete. Such carelessness is inexcusable and creates an unfavourable impression. The strict limitations of space now imposed on the Journal prevent us from discussing the valuable contents of the book at length. I must confine myself to saying in general terms that so far as I can judge the author is right in maintaining his thesis concerning the early date of the most important works of Tamil literature as being somewhere about the second century of the Christian era.

Chapter ii, headed "Mauryan Invasion of Southern India", which presents historical passages from the literature not previously accessible, is of special interest to me, and may be justly described as of much importance. The author shows that Māmulanār, a Brahman poet of the Third Madura Academy, writing perhaps in the second century B.C. makes frequent allusions to the Mauryas in the past having penetrated with a great army as far as the Podiyil Hill in the Tinnevely District. The statements of Māmulanār are supported by two other authors, Paranar (*alias* Paran Korranār) and Kaḷḷil Aṭṭiraiyanār. The army, including a northern tribe called Kośar (the Kośakāra of *Rām.* iv, 40, 121, etc., Kumbakonam ed.), advanced from the Konkan, passing the mountain Eḷil-malai, 16 miles north of Cannanore, the Mont D'Ély of Marco Polo, and entered the Kongu or Coimbatore District, ultimately going as far as the Podiyil Hill, which seems to be the same as the Podiyam peak in the Tinnevely District, also known as Agastya malai. The author holds that the literature indicates a series of "Aryan" or northern invasions under the Mauryas and Āndhras. Those military expeditions were quite distinct from the peaceful Aryan penetration which had begun in very early times.

Professor Krishnaswāmi does not mention a good paper by K. P. Jayaswal entitled "The Empire of Bindusāra" (J.B.O. Res. Soc., ii, 81), which collects the indications approximating to proof that the Maurya conquest of the South was effected by Asoka's father, Bindusāra.

Asoka unquestionably ruled over the northern part of Mysore, and there is no reason to doubt that Tāranāth's sources correctly ascribed the conquest of the South to Bindusāra. Maski, where the recently discovered Asoka inscription exists, is in an ancient gold-field, a fact which sufficiently accounts for the name of Suvarṇagiri (Golden-hill) as that of the headquarters or capital of Asoka's Viceroy of the south (Minor Rock Edict I, Brahmagiri text). Suvarṇagiri probably was in the neighbourhood of Maski, which is a place of extreme antiquity, occupied even in neolithic times. All these matters require to be worked out in a separate essay.

The extreme southern region attained by Bindusāra's army was not held permanently by the Mauryas. Presumably the Tamil powers drove back the invaders to the northern districts of Mysore, which Asoka retained.

The final dislodgment of the northerners from the peninsula probably was subsequent to the fall of the Sungas, an event which happened about 73 B.C. The literature indicates the existence of a Tamil league.

The northern armies may be presumed to have marched through Khāndēsh by the road passing Burhānpur and Asīrgaṛh, the famous Dakṣināpatha or Southern Road. They then moved through the Konkan, and so on into Kongu (Coimbatore and Salēm) either through the Pālghāt Gap, or by the Satyamangalam Pass. I now believe that the Satyaputra kingdom of Asoka's edict is represented by the Satyamangalam region in the Coimbatore District, and not by the Tulu country, as I conjectured formerly.

It is obvious that the new evidence opened up by the

learned Professor throws much fresh light upon Mauryan history and on the prolonged survival for centuries of well-known local dynasties claiming descent from the great Buddhist emperor.

V. A. S.

---

THE SEPOY. By EDMUND CANDLER. John Murray, 1919.  
7s. 6d. net.

Those who have taken part in campaigns in which our gallant Indian troops have served will appreciate Mr. Candler's sympathetic book. The author was Eyewitness for Mesopotamia, and thus had great opportunities for adding to his knowledge of all classes of Indian soldiers—Gurkhas, Sikhs, Punjabi Mussalmans, Pathans, Dogras, and so forth. English ignorance about India is still far too comprehensive, and it is just such a book as this which is wanted to portray the difference of the races and their castes which make up the Indian Army. Mr. Candler's stories of them are delightful; there is one of three Gurkhas, during a heavy bombardment by the Turks, throwing bricks on the corrugated iron roof of a British signaller's dug-out, thus adding to the enemy's fire with an illusion to scare the signaller, who was wisely lying doggo, until one of the Gurkhas appeared at his door and gave the show away with his peculiar and expansive grin. It is the same grin which remains in my own mind as a souvenir of the retreat from Ctesiphon in 1915; we had two or three hundred wounded troops on board our steamer and its barges, and very few to tend them, and there was great difficulty in getting the food of the different castes cooked. But of all the different troops on board the Gurkhas looked after their brothers best, and their grin was most inspiring in a time of depression.

One of the pregnant sayings in the book is that on the

first page; the fame of one race "is deserved, but the exclusiveness of it was resented in days when one seldom heard of the Mahratta, Jat, Dogra, and Punjabi Mussalman". This book will go far to divide more evenly the honours due to the different components of the Indian Army.

R. CAMPBELL THOMPSON.

---

THE SILK INDUSTRY AND TRADE. By RATAN C. RAWLLEY, M.A. pp. xiii, 172. London: P. S. King & Son. 1919.

This is a useful book by the author of *Economics of the Silk Trade*, a Carnegie Research Fellow and Investigator in Industrial Economics. He deals with the British and French Silk Industries in parts i and ii, and part iii treats of Prices, Consumption, Commercial Organization, Preliminary, Grading and Standardization, Packing and Shipping, Distribution and Control of the Silk Industry in India. The writer is in favour of private enterprise aided by State capital. In an Appendix is a succinct historical synopsis of India's silk industry from Roman times onwards. The *tasar* silkworm (*Antherda Siwalika*) is indigenous to India and feeds on the *beri* tree (*Zizyphus jujuba*). Efforts have been made to domesticate it in Bombay and the Punjab, but without success. The domesticated variety must, however, have been known in India from a remote period, as Indian silk was an important article of trade from the time of Julius Cæsar, or even earlier, though its production was probably confined to Kashmir and Kabul, and China furnished a far greater supply. In 1875 its export declined, thereafter consisting mainly of waste silk, and France and Japan monopolized the production of manufactured silk. The industry, however, lingered on in Bengal till 1899, when steps were taken to revive it. Kashmir, too, resuscitated its export

trade under State control, and recently a good deal has been done to re-start production as a village industry in Gurdaspur and other submontane districts of the Punjab not mentioned by Mr. Rawlley.<sup>1</sup> He has, nevertheless, contrived to give a great deal of information in a compact work which should be of considerable value to Indians and to officials in India who are trying to increase the production of Indian silks on lines suitable for foreign markets. The work is adequately indexed.

H. A. R.

---

THE COUNTRIES AND TRIBES OF THE PERSIAN GULF. By  
Colonel S. B. MILES.

The Persian Gulf is hotter than the Red Sea, and its coasts and islands are sun-blistered and arid, but yet its inland waters may have witnessed the earliest attempts of mankind at navigation. This is a main theme of Colonel Miles, who, after referring to movements of tribes which colonized the province, deals with the prowess of the Arab sailors, who opened up trade between India and Mesopotamia, and incidentally introduced into the former country the civilization of the latter, one relic of this ancient trade being the *man* or *maund*, which, of Babylonian origin, still remains the standard measure of weight in India, Persia, and elsewhere.

The great aid to the Arab navigators was the south-west monsoon, which drove their vessels so rapidly before it that the two thousand miles from Zanzibar to Maskat were covered in an incredibly short time, in days rather than in weeks; it is hardly necessary to state that the so-called "discovery" of the monsoon by Hippalus was known to the Arabs from time immemorial.

The political freedom or subordination of Oman depended very much upon the power or weakness of the

<sup>1</sup> See the valuable note on this subject in the *Hoshiarpur District Gazetteer*, 1884, pp. 107-9, by Mr. W. Coldstream, I.C.S.

Persian Empire as balanced against the situation in Arabia, and we read a striking instance of this. Among the famous public works of Arabia was the dam of Mareb in the Yemen, which irrigated a comparatively large tract of country. About 130 A.D., owing to neglect, the dam was broken, causing the dispersal of the tribes in the neighbourhood. Among them was the Azd tribe, which marched eastwards and occupied the province to which it gave the name of Oman, in memory of a similarly named valley in the Yemen homeland. The Persian Empire at that time was represented by Parthia, and a Parthian satrap ruled Oman, but the invaders were strong enough to defeat and expel the Persians and to occupy the province.

Some four centuries later Arabia became an object of keen interest to both the Roman and the Persian empires. The Himyarite empire of the Yemen fell before the Abyssinians, who were Christians and under the influence of Rome. Persia was then ruled by perhaps her greatest monarch, Naushirwan, who viewed this change in the balance of power with displeasure, which a refugee prince of the Himyarite dynasty was ever at hand to inflame. The distance from Obolla, the port on the Shatt-ul-Arab adjacent to the modern Basra, to Aden was some 2,000 miles. It therefore speaks well both for the resolution of Naushirwan and the efficiency of sea transport at this period that this expedition was carried through successfully, the Himyarite dynasty being restored and the Abyssinians defeated. Incidentally Persia subjugated the Bahrayn Islands and Oman, the ports of which formed the stages on her long line of communications.

The scene now changes and, owing to the rise of Islam, Arabia became a great conquering power. The effect on Oman and the Persian Gulf was a striking increase in prosperity, and a general advance in civilization. But before long the tribal restlessness reasserted itself and

Oman was struggling to be free from the yoke of the Caliph, who drew a revenue of £150,000 from the province. It is interesting to note that Muhallab, who played such a leading part on the stages of Khorasan and Central Asia was an Omani.

The province suffered less than other parts of the Caliphate, owing mainly to its inaccessibility, but yet, during the two centuries preceding A.D. 1064, it suffered ten invasions at the hands of Arabs, Turks, Persians, Karmathians, Daylamites, and the Seljuks.

Again the scene changes, and at the beginning of the sixteenth century Portuguese squadrons appear in the Persian Gulf and Red Sea, and by their valour and energy cut the arteries of trade which supplied Turkey and Egypt with prosperity. The leading figure was Albuquerque, whose "frightfulness" may well have inspired our late enemies, for cruising along the coast of Oman he sacked the towns, massacring and mutilating men, women, and children. Hurmuz became the headquarters of the Portuguese, and I have marvelled at the strength of its fort, and equally at the occupation of such a barren and waterless island as a great trade emporium; but great and famous it was, as readers of Milton can testify.

The Persian Gulf witnessed Turkey's great attempt to expel the Portuguese, and its utter failure, the author aptly pointing out that Turkey, invincible in the Mediterranean and at the zenith of her power, should have made far greater efforts to destroy the Portuguese, whose base was much the more distant.

For English readers, the struggle for ascendancy in the Persian Gulf makes thrilling reading, the capture of Hurmuz in A.D. 1622 by our brave seamen in alliance with Persia constituting a victory which was followed by decisive results, for Portugal, although she concentrated on Maskat, was expelled from that stronghold in A.D. 1649



by the Omanis, who subsequently attacked their oppressors in India. Indeed, at the opening of the eighteenth century the Oman pirates became a terror to merchant vessels of all nations, raiding not only the coast of India, but the distant coast of East Africa, and ceaselessly warring against the hated Portuguese. Simultaneously with the depredations of these Arab rovers, the Indian Ocean for a period of thirty years was troubled by European pirates, chiefly British; among them was the notorious Captain Kidd, who hardly merited his fame, for he certainly lacked daring and initiative.

The last invasion of Oman by Persia was planned by Nadir, who, more than any other Shah, realized the importance of sea power. Under the leadership of *Mirza Muhammad Taki Khan*, a force of six thousand men landed in Oman and captured Maskat, thanks mainly to the adhesion of a deposed Imam of the Yaareba dynasty, which had ruled for over a century in Oman. But a deliverer arose in the person of Ahmad bin Said, who was a camel-driver, but yet showed such great qualities that he not only freed Oman from the Persians but founded a new dynasty. Thanks to his energy and initiative, the Persian commander finally made peace and quitted Oman, whereupon the garrison of Maskat was so strictly blockaded that it surrendered, and Persia finally gave up the province after a connexion extending, although not without interruptions, well over a millennium. The year 1798 was one of especial importance for Oman, as in it the Imam entered into political relations with Great Britain, and signed a treaty by the terms of which a factory was established at the port; it is satisfactory to know that since that date the relations of Oman with Great Britain have been ever closer and more cordial.

The beginning of the nineteenth century marked the first invasion of Oman by the Wahabis, fanatical Puritans from the Najd, who, until their capital was taken by

Muhammad Ali, Viceroy of Egypt, in 1818, raided and massacred without mercy, and with much success. Their tenets are now being revived in Arabia under the title of *Akhwan* or "The Brethren". Under their protection the Jowasnis of the Pirate Coast rose from being a pest to a menace to the existence of trade in the Persian Gulf. At first the British took half-hearted action, but in 1819 they captured and destroyed Ras-al-Khayma, and then inaugurated a system which gradually developed into the Resident at Bushire maintaining the *Pax Britannica* in the Persian Gulf. This constitutes an achievement of which we as a race may well feel proud, based on the fine work of officials like the author of this work, of whom, when I first visited the Persian Gulf, it was said that whenever Maskat was seized by the tribesmen "Colonel Miles routed out the rebels with a thick stick". In conclusion, the work suffers through its publication some years after its author's death, and a map is sorely needed, but it will be a valuable book of reference to the student, and will certainly keep green the memory of its author.

P. M. SYKES.

---

A SMALL HANDBOOK TO THE HISTORY AND ANTIQUITIES OF MESOPOTAMIA FROM THE EARLIEST TIMES TO THE END OF THE SASANIAN PERIOD. By R. CAMPBELL THOMPSON, M.A., F.S.A., Captain S.S.O., I.E.F.D. pp. ii + 68. Baghdad, 1918. Price 1 rupee.

In this small pamphlet thirty-seven pages are devoted to a necessarily very brief account of the peoples inhabiting Mesopotamia and the empires which arose in the country, from the earliest period of which historic records have survived, 4000-3000 B.C., down to the occupation of Babylon by Alexander the Great.

Following this, pp. 38-51 are occupied by a Chronological Table of the principal events occurring between the death of Alexander in 323 B.C. and the conquest of Mesopotamia by the Arabs in A.D. 637, and the final destruction of the Sasanian Empire in A.D. 652.

The rest of the work, pp. 52-68, is occupied by short notes on the principal sites which have been examined by Western archæologists, of whom Rawlinson, Layard, and Botta in the middle of last century were the pioneers.

The officers and men of the British forces in Mesopotamia were undoubtedly the public whom the author had in view when compiling this unambitious primer, and within the narrow limits he has laid down for himself he has succeeded in conveying in a readable form much information which will be new and interesting to the latest invaders of this ancient battlefield of nations.

Without incurring any necessity to alter the modest claim of his title Captain Campbell Thompson could, I think, increase the gratitude of his public by adding a sketch-map to show the position of the more important places, ancient and modern, mentioned in his text, and a short list of popular or semi-popular works to which recourse may be had for fuller information. He contents himself with acknowledging his own indebtedness to Sykes's *History of Persia*, L. W. King's *History of Sumer and Akkad*, Professor Koldewey's *Excavations at Babylon*, and Baedeker and Murray—works which he chanced to have at his command on service.

The pronunciation of place-names might be indicated more exactly. Nāsiri-yah might then hope to be pronounced with the stress on the penultimate and not on the antepenultimate syllable, the form affected by some officers even of the highest rank and in touch with G.H.Q.

In view of the title of the work it might be noted that Shūsh is in Persia, and not even geographically in

Mesopotamia. If the needs and knowledge of the British public were under contemplation it would further be desirable to explain that Mesopotamia and Persia are not interchangeable terms, and that Baghdad and Basrah are not in the latter country; but of this members of the I.E.F.D. are, I believe, generally aware. It is only in this country that one can hear an archæologist who has been working in Mesopotamia and has assumed Arab dress referred to as "digging in Persia disguised as a Hittite".

D. L.

---

#### RECENT ARABIC LITERATURE

IBN AL-KALBI. LE LIVRE DES IDOLES (KITAB AL-AŞNAM).

Publié par AHMED ZEKI PACHA. Cairo, 1914.

Renaissance des Lettres Arabes.

JAḤİZ. LE LIVRE DE LA COURONNE (KITAB AL-TAJ).

Edited by the same. Same date, place, and series.

The name of Ahmed Zeki Pasha is familiarly and favourably known to Arabic scholars by his edition of the *Tibr Masbuk* of Sakhawi, a continuation of Maqrizi's history, and numerous other publications. The two volumes before us, which are probably the firstfruits of the enterprise called The Renaissance of Arabic Literature, of which the Pasha gave an account to the Athens Congress of 1912, are beautifully and luxuriously printed on excellent paper, and appear also to be models of accuracy and of patient research. The editor has provided them with all that could be desired in the way of prolegomena, notes, and indices.

The contents of the first of these works will be disappointing to those who may have expected that it would throw some considerable light on Arabian paganism. It is very short, sixty-four pages in all, and a considerable portion of many of the pages is occupied by the Pasha's

notes. A great deal of the matter is already familiar from other sources, such as Azraqi's *History of Meccah*, and especially Yaqut's *Geographical Dictionary*. Its general trustworthiness appears to be very moderate. The Qur'an and the Biography of the Prophet had preserved certain names and their association with certain tribes; and some ingenious persons had exercised their imaginations in the excogitation of *midrash*. There was no literature of pagan Arabia (if the Qur'an is to be believed) giving any systematic account of its mythology; and the poetical allusions (even if we suppose the pre-Islamic verses to be genuine) were not very numerous. Converts to Islam of the earliest generations had no wish to preserve any memories of the beliefs which the new religion condemned so unsparingly. Hence when the archæological interest arose, it exercised itself on very inadequate material.

The work of Jahiz is of far greater originality and importance. It deals with the etiquette of the 'Abbasid court, and bears some resemblance to the treatise of Constantine Porphyrogenitus *de Cerimoniis Aulae Byzantinæ*. It is somewhat less discursive than the other works of the same author which have as yet been published. The writer appears to regard the 'Abbasid dynasty as the heir of the Sassanian, and regularly illustrates his precepts from Sassanian precedents. Of both the Persian and the Arabian sovereigns and their ways he claims intimate knowledge. He records their various formulæ for dismissing their guests, and can tell us how often each of them had his linen washed, and how many days a week each of them drank wine. His stories about the Persian kings give the appearance of folklore rather than history; the Pasha has given references to various legendary works wherein several of them occur.

The rules of etiquette enjoined seem on the whole to

resemble those of other courts. Many of them are exceedingly trifling. When the king tells a story which the courtier has heard before the latter must give no hint of the fact. A man who has enjoyed the king's society once should, if he have the honour a second time, act as though he had not previously experienced it. One who is dining with the king should (apparently) leave his food untouched. In any case he should not finish before His Majesty. One must not laugh at the king's jokes. In telling him a story one must not use expletives, such as "don't you see? don't you know?" If the king goes to sleep the courtiers retire to a distance and wait till he wakes. The king should let no one know where he proposes to sleep on any night. This last rule is said to have been observed by the late Abd al-Hamid II.

The Pasha's treatment of both text and matter appears to be absolutely exhaustive, and such corrections of the text as might occur to the reader are anticipated by him in his appendices. We must congratulate the *Renaissance des Lettres Arabes* on commencing with works which will raise the standard of scholarly performance in both East and West.

LANGUE DES BEDOUINS 'ANAZEH, TEXTE ARABE, etc.

Par le comte CARLO DE LANDBERG. Two parts.  
Leiden: Brill. 1919.

Count Landberg, not being a Professor who might expect a *Festschrift* to be dedicated to him on his 70th birthday, as he tells us, celebrates that occasion by the publication of these pamphlets, of which the longer contains four stories in text, transliteration, and translation, illustrating the dialect of the 'Anazeh. The shorter, which is called the Preface, might have emanated from Professor Teufelsdröckh's chair, as it is partly autobiographical, partly apologetic, and in part a homily

on "things in general". On many of these subjects this Journal has no opinion, e.g. modern millinery, Bolshevism, the Jewish Press, hereditary monarchy, established churches, the results of the French Revolution. Since Mr. P. Griffin Stokes in his admirable translation of Dozy's *Spanish Islam* accounts for the failure of that work by its being written in French when the author's compatriots thought it should have been in Dutch—we are not surprised to learn that the Count has provoked the resentment of his Swedish countrymen by addressing the world in German or French.

More nearly connected with the subjects of this Journal are the Count's judgments on various matters. The best Arab sovereigns, he holds, were the Umayyads. The greater part of Arabic literature has been destroyed by Turkish hordes. The *Sultan er-Rum* has never been recognized as legitimate *khalifah* by the Arabs. The Moslem religion is in its essence absolutely opposed to all modern progress. These propositions are no less remarkable than his statement that in Switzerland bishops are dispensed with.

In the texts which form the larger of the two pamphlets the Count conducts his colleagues, "who are probably as pacific as himself, and equally disgusted with the situation produced by the fratricidal war, into the tents of the Bedouins, into the desert." They will be disappointed if they hope thereby to escape the nauseating atmosphere of bloodshed; the stories deal with Bedouin camel-lifting, murders, and wars: the difference is one of scale. Probably the readers will be concerned with the language rather than with the matter of these narratives, and it will be granted that the Count has done his best to reproduce the sounds which he heard, and interpret them. His work is therefore a valuable addition to his already numerous publications in the same and similar fields.

TEXTES EN ARABE DU DIALECTE DE RABAT. Par L. BRUNOT. Fes: Imprimerie Municipale. 1918.

This is a pamphlet of forty-two pages in the Arabic character without note or gloss. It must be supposed that it is intended as a basis for oral instruction. The matter consists of descriptions of rites, superstitions, and the like. The language seems far nearer the classical idiom than that of Count Landberg's texts.

A BRIEF CHRONOLOGY OF THE MUHAMMADAN MONUMENTS OF EGYPT TO A.D. 1517. By Captain K. A. C. CRESWELL, B.A.F. Extrait du Bulletin de l'Institut Français d'Archéologie Orientale, t. xvi. Cairo, 1919.

The Islamic monuments of Egypt are the subject of a very considerable literature, of which M. van Berchem's *Corpus Inscriptionum* is probably the most notable work. Captain Creswell has compiled a list of these monuments in chronological order, to which there are appended an alphabetical list and select illustrations. His accounts of the buildings are concise, but call attention to all matters of importance, and give the necessary references to works which contain fuller descriptions and detailed explanations. All who are interested in Islamic archæology will be grateful to Captain Creswell for this valuable and painstaking register, which will materially facilitate their studies.

ÉTUDE SUR LES EMPRUNTS SYRIAQUES DANS LES PARLERS ARABES DU LIBAN. Par MICHEL T. FEGHALI. Paris: Honoré Champion. 1918.

The Abbé Feghali, Professor of Arabic at the Colonial Institute, Bordeaux, has collected in this pamphlet the words in use in the Arabic of Kfar 'Abida in the Lebanon which may be regarded as survivals of the older Syriac idiom, which became obsolete after the Moslem conquest. The village is not mentioned by Cuinet in his statistical



work on the Lebanon; a Kafr 'Abid, which receives passing notice in Miss G. L. Bell's *The Desert and the Sown* (1908, p. 260), cannot well be the same. Since the name of the village is Syriac in both elements, the dialect of the place might well show numerous traces of the earlier language; and the Abbé has endeavoured to follow the strictest of scientific methods in dealing with them. Obviously those which belong to the sphere of religious technicalities are somewhat different in character from those which belong to everyday life; a classified index appended to the dissertation does justice to this fact. The collection of other words is quite considerable in number, and includes many terms belonging to agriculture. The attempt made to trace the influence of Syriac syntax on the dialect is admitted by the author to be less successful.

D. S. M.

---

A HANDBOOK FOR TRAVELLERS IN INDIA, BURMA, AND CEYLON. Tenth edition. Murray, 1919. Price 24s. net.

Murray's *Handbook of India*, now a substantial volume of 726 pages, has a long history going back to 1859. The tenth and latest edition is the work of Mr. C. E. Buckland, C.I.E., the competent scholar who edited its immediate predecessor in 1913. Generally speaking, the book seems to fulfil admirably its purpose as a serviceable and trustworthy guide for travellers. In this place detailed criticism may be confined to those sections which more particularly concern the Royal Asiatic Society. The corrections may be useful for the next edition.

p. lviii, line 32. For "Imam" read "Imān".

p. lx, foot. The statement about the beginning of the Ilāhī era is inaccurate. See *Akbar, the Great Mogul*, 1917, p. 31, note.

p. lxii. The Sultans of Delhi were not "chiefly Pathan".

p. lxiii. Our old and non-existent friend, "Muhammad Kasim," turns up once more.

p. lxiv. Delhi was sacked by Ahmad Shāh Durrāni in 1756, not 1757.

p. lxxiii. The assertion that the Śaka era runs from the birth of Salivahan, "a king who reigned in the South of India," is rash, to say the least.

p. lxxvi. Some of the Rājput dynasties are much older than the Muhammadan conquest.

p. lxxxi. Ptolemy is not called "Turmayaparni" in the Asoka Edicts, nor is Cunningham's book the best reference for the Edicts.

p. xci. The Great War has proved that the Mahrattas have *not* "lost their warlike qualities".

p. 232. Mumtāz Mahall bore fourteen, not only seven, children to Shāhjahān. No sound reason exists for connecting Austin of Bordeaux with the Tāj.

p. 244. Fathpur-Sikrī was abandoned in 1585 when Akbar removed his court to the Panjāb for thirteen years. The alleged defects in the water supply probably did not then exist, and certainly were not the reason for the desertion of the town.

p. 248. The statement that "it was from Babar's victory that Sikri received the name of Fatehpur" is erroneous. The name, originally Fathābād, was given by Akbar to commemorate the conquest of Gujarāt (*Akbar*, p. 105).

The sections on Architecture, Ancient Monuments, and Arts have been compiled carefully, and are generally sound. The glossary is well done.

V. A. S.

---

THE MEGALITHIC CULTURE OF INDONESIA. By W. J. PERRY, B.A. Manchester: University Press. 1918.

This work is somewhat inadequately described by its title. The megalithic objects it discusses are not confined to Indonesia, but include those of certain tribes of the Assam-Burma borderland, whose connexion with Indonesia is not very close. They exclude, on the other hand, those of Java, Sumatra, the Malay Peninsula, and some other portions of Indonesia, on the ground that those regions have been influenced by the civilizations associated with Brahmanism, Buddhism, or Islam.

On the basis of the distribution of the megaliths and other stone structures and objects of the region comprised in his survey, the author builds up a somewhat elaborate superstructure. By a chain of arguments, which it would take too long to give here even in outline, he arrives at the conclusion that the megaliths, etc., are due to the immigration of some foreign race, which in certain localities attained to the position of a ruling class and also introduced certain cults and myths, the habit of terrace cultivation, etc. It may reasonably be doubted whether the basis is strong enough to support the superstructure. To begin with, there exists at present no exhaustive survey of the stone work of the region, and its distribution has not been correlated with the geological and topographical conditions affecting the comparative availability of stone and other materials. Nor, on the other hand, has there been an exhaustive survey of the cults and myths, etc., supposed to be specially associated with the use of stone. In fact, the evidence on all these matters is at present incomplete.

It is difficult, for example, to follow the reasoning which connects the use of stone with the system of terrace cultivation. The latter is essentially necessary for the watering of sloping ground in hilly country, its use being determined by purely topographical conditions,

if the land is to be irrigated at all. It does not, therefore, differ in kind, but merely in detail, from the ordinary mode of irrigating flat valleys or plains. Yet, as it is in hilly ground that stone is usually more easily accessible, it would seem only natural that it should be more often associated with terrace irrigation than with agriculture in alluvial plains, where owing to local conditions stone is less commonly found. But the system of rice-cultivation in irrigable plots is essentially the same wherever it occurs, from India to Japan. Can it, as a whole, be shown to be specially connected with the use of megaliths? In Indonesia it certainly seems to mark a step in cultural development, and in so far as that is the case there would be nothing very strange if that step were also accompanied by a freer use of stone, wherever such material is readily available. Again, the relation of stone structures to a class of chiefs (which is an essential link in the argument) seems also to be of a somewhat ambiguous character. Stone requires more labour in construction than wood. Is it not natural, therefore, that its use should be more or less confined to that portion of the community which has the best means of commanding and directing labour? One can see similar distinctions in many an English churchyard where the graves of the poor are not marked by any monument, or at most by a wooden cross.

A great many of the cults and myths discussed in the book are of almost worldwide distribution, or at any rate are not confined to the areas here surveyed. Are we entitled to insist on their local association, even assuming it to be proved, with the distribution of stone structures? Some of these matters seem to be capable of alternative explanations. For instance, it is inferred that the stone-using immigrants, as the author calls them, practised incestuous unions. Yet, in spite of this, as he frankly points out, the supernatural beings with whom he

identifies the supposed immigrants sometimes condemn or punish such unions when committed by ordinary mortals. But such legends of incestuous union seem to be merely inevitable inferences from the tales of origin, either from a single individual or a single pair, which are so common in the crude imaginings of uncivilized races when speculating upon the beginnings of mankind or of their own particular tribe. If you assume, as the logical tendency is, such narrowly circumscribed sources of origin for a race, you necessarily assert or imply an incestuous union (as we should term it) at the starting-point, at any rate.

Mr. Perry's work is a closely reasoned, conscientiously elaborated argument, based on data which, though not exhaustive, are numerous and carefully sifted, and it is therefore a work for which the author deserves much credit. The main point, however, is whether it really proves anything at all, and under the present conditions of our knowledge of these matters I am disposed to think that that must for some time remain an open question. The new school of anthropology is still in process of developing its methods—whether on right lines or not, it is difficult and perhaps premature to decide. But I confess that to my mind the results, so far as they can be judged at all by a mere layman without technical knowledge, do not always seem conclusive, or even highly probable. There is one underlying assumption which, for the present at any rate, one does not feel at all inclined to accept, namely, that any given idea or practice has always been diffused from some one original source; that, in fact, nothing in the world has ever been discovered or invented more than once. Mr. Perry is evidently under the spell of this new school, to whom Andrew Lang, with his sound common sense in the handling of these matters, must seem a hopelessly misguided heretic. As he pointed out, if you find flint arrowheads almost

indistinguishable in make and shape in pretty nearly every part of the globe, it is not necessary to infer that the art and practice of making them first arose at some particular spot and then spread from it as a centre in all directions. The similarity of human needs and the existence in very many places of a similar suitable material are quite enough to account for the wide distribution and general resemblance of such things.

But nowadays one is almost invited to believe that no boy anywhere in the world had ever picked up a stone to throw at a bird, without some stranger from a far distant country having first informed him, either directly or indirectly, that such a thing could be done. When one considers the difficulty and slowness of communication in former days, it is surely the height of rashness to assume that people in remote parts of the world must everywhere have waited indefinitely till every invention that has contributed to their material welfare came drifting in from some special hotbed of culture such as Egypt or Babylonia. However, that is a very big subject, hardly suitable for discussion in this place. If I have introduced it at all, it is because it seems to have influenced Mr. Perry's judgment and point of view to what I venture to consider an undesirable and unfortunate extent, colouring his mind with certain preconceptions which have unconsciously biassed him in his handling of the evidence discussed in this book and seriously affecting the value of his arguments.

---

C. O. BLAGDEN.

THE PALÆOGRAPHY OF INDIA. By RAI BAHADUR  
PANDIT GAURISHANKAR HIRACHAND OJHA. Second  
edition (revised and enlarged). Printed by the  
Scottish Mission Industries Company, Ltd., Ajmer.

Pandit Gaurishankar Ojha, the learned curator of the  
Rajputana Museum at Ajmer, has rendered a real service

to the cause of epigraphical research in bringing out a new edition of his work on Indian palæography, which appeared first in 1894 under the title *Prāchīna Lipimālā*. The book has been thoroughly revised, enlarged, and brought up to date, so that it has now grown to an imposing volume of thrice its original size.

After a preface and an introduction containing an *aperçu* of the progress of antiquarian researches in India, the author discusses in his first four chapters: the antiquity of the art of writing in Ancient India, the origin of the Brāhmī and Kharoshthī alphabets, and the history of the decipherment of ancient characters. The next fourteen chapters give an account of the ancient alphabets, of India: Brāhmī, Gupta, Kuṭila,<sup>1</sup> Nāgarī, Śāradā, Bengali, the Western script, that of the Central Provinces, Telugu-Canarese, Grantha, Kalinga, Tamil, Vaṭṭeluttu, and Kharoshthī. Two special chapters (xix-xx) are devoted to the numerical symbols of the Brāhmī (and its descendants), and of the Kharoshthī. In his chapter xxi the author treats of the principal Indian scripts of the present day, their evolution from the ancient Brāhmī being discussed in the next chapter. A special chapter deals with the evolution of the Nāgarī numerical figures. The final chapter (xxiv) gives an account of the writing materials: palm-leaf, birch-bark, paper, cotton-cloth, wood, silk, leather, stone, brick (and earthenware), gold, silver, copper, brass, bell-metal, iron, ink, reed-pens, and other instruments for writing. To these twenty-four chapters is added an Appendix containing a dissertation on the epochs of various eras used in India.

Throughout his work Pandit Ojha has fully utilized the results of antiquarian research during the twenty-four years which have elapsed since the first appearance

<sup>1</sup> The term *Kuṭila* would better have been replaced by "acute-angled", as according to Bühler, *Indische Palaeographie*, p. 50, it is based on an erroneous rendering of the expression *kuṭila akshara* in the Devae Praśasti.

of his book. In his discussion of the Śāradā, for instance, he has made use of the epigraphical materials which have come to light in the West Himalayan hill State of Chambā. Pandit Ojha's book is composed in a Hindī which is remarkable for its clearness and purity. It shows how well a modern Indo-Aryan language adapts itself for a scientific work of this kind.

The book will no doubt be welcomed in the first instance by the author's countrymen, as it will help to stimulate their interest in the historical records of their country, and guide their studies in the field of palæographical research. But to European scholars too, even those who are not familiar with Hindī, the work under review will be valuable on account of the eighty-four carefully prepared plates which form the second part of Pandit Ojha's volume. Plates i-lxx contain not only complete reproductions of the various ancient scripts (both single *aksharas* and ligatures), but also facsimiles of portions of inscriptions, the Nāgarī transcripts of the latter being given in the chapters where the scripts are discussed. Plates lxxi-lxxvi give tables of the numerals. It was an excellent idea to include the principal modern alphabets (modern Śāradā, Tākari, Gurmukhī, Kaithī, Bengali, Maithil, Uṛiyā, Gujrātī, Marāṭhī, Telugu, Canarese, Grantha, Malayālam, Tuḷu, and Tamil), and to add a few plates which show the gradual development of some of these (Nāgarī, Śāradā, Bengali, Canarese, Grantha, and Tamil) from the ancient Brāhmī.

J. PH. V.

---

THE DĪWĀN OF GHAILĀN IBN 'UQBAH, KNOWN AS  
DHU 'R-RUMMAH. Edited by C. H. H. MACARTNEY.  
Cambridge University Press, 1919.

In editing the poems of Dhu 'r-Rummah for the first time, Mr. Macartney has completed, with success, a task



that would have weighed heavily on a much younger man. He acknowledges help given by several British and German scholars, and particularly by Mr. Krenkow, who has read and revised the proofs throughout, but the main burden must have fallen on himself. The result is a fine volume containing about 700 pages of text and scholia, together with a full *apparatus criticus*. Of the seven principal codices consulted either in transcripts or photographic prints, the two best, which comprise between them something like two-thirds of the *Diwân*, are preserved in the Faiziyya Mosque at Constantinople and the Ambrosian Library at Milan; these, unfortunately, were not available until much of the book was already in type, and as regards that portion their readings have been supplied in the list of corrigenda. The copyist of the Constantinople MS. claims to have derived his text from the tradition of Abû Naṣr, the nephew of al-Aṣma'î, and the editor concludes "that the original text was that of al-Aṣma'î, and that the glosses were largely based upon the commentary of (Abû 'Amr) ash-Shaibânî". The inferiority of the remaining MSS. is marked, while the glosses are apt to shirk real difficulties.

Although I have not been able to examine the *Diwân* thoroughly, my impression is that Mr. Macartney has taken great pains to establish the text and, considering the obstacles with which he was faced, has done his work very well. If it hardly reaches the standard set by Sir Charles Lyall and Professor Bevan, only unreasonable critics will find fault with it for that. Whatever be the qualities which make an ideal editor of pre-Islamic poetry, there is no doubt that the combination seldom occurs. Learning, though necessary as a basis, will not go far alone, nor achieve the utmost unless crowned by a peculiar balance of judgment, feeling, and imagination. Few editions of this kind are final in the sense that they leave little room for improvement in detail. Mr. Macartney

gives us all the requisite materials for criticism, and I am sure he will be the first to welcome it. Perhaps some of the following suggestions, which include uncorrected misprints, may commend themselves to him:—

- | page | verse |   |
|------|-------|---|
| 195  | ١٠    | عِيدَانَهَا.  |
| "    | ١١    | الثَّقَلَيْنِ.  |
| 214  | ٢٨    | الْعُيُونِ for الْأَعْيُنِ, which is unmetrical.  |
| 233  | ٤٩    | المُجْمَعُ.   |
| 239  | ٧٨    | عَلِمَتْ. Cf. 'Amr b. Kulthúm's <i>Mu'allaga</i> , ed. Lyall, v. 29.  |
| 240  | ٥     | فَلا صَبْرَ اسْتَعْبَارِ الْعَيْنِ = فَلا صَبْرَ أَنْ تَسْتَعْمِرَ الْعَيْنَ, "No patience is (consists in) weeping," as the commentators explain it.                     |
| 258  | ٣     | وَلَمْ أَلِخْ and لَيْلِي, and in the second hemistich, "When I used fearlessly to let men see my temperament, whose chider (conscience) did not restrain it from folly." |
| 259  | ١٠    | تَسْتَعْمِرُ لِي and فَجِنَتْ.  |
| 262  | ١٢    | تَنَاسَى.   |
| "    | ١٥    | عَرَضَتْ and لَمْ تُسْتَشْعِرِ.   |
| 263  | ١٦    | يَسْلُو ذِكْرَ مَيَّةٍ فَلَيْبِهِ.  |
| "    | ١٨    | يُورِنُ أَهْلَهَا seems the better reading.   |
| 265  | ٢٥    | مَحْبُورًا فَخَيْرًا مِنَ الْحَبِيرِ.   |
| 266  | ٣٢    | تَعَاوَرَهَا.   |
| 271  | ٥٥    | الْأَقْوَامِ.   |
| "    | ٥٩    | تَصَاغُرُ.  |
| 271  | "     | Probably طَشَّاشٌ وَوَلِيَّةٌ.  |
| 287  | ٢٢    | يَظَلُّ.  |
| "    | ٢٣    | قُرُونِ.  |

- page verse  
 299 ٧٢ تُكْسِرُ أَذْنَابَ.  
 301 ٨١ تُوجِّهُ.  
 303 ٨ فَمَا يَشْنِ نَفْسِي.  
 304 ٩ أَأَدَى اللَّهَ.  
 306 ٢١ Perhaps بِإِخْشَادِ أَمْوَارِ الْبَوَارِحِ.  
 308 ٣٠ تُطِيلُ for تَطْلُ.  
 312 ٧ Read with Ambr. and Const. "There is always a (sore) place (in my heart) that causes a fresh outbreak of the malady arising in me from (recollection of) the scenes of our love". It is possible to read مُجَلِّ and translate: "There is always something that causes the malady . . . to lodge (in my heart) and revive."  
 312, last line. يَنْكَسِ.  
 315 ١٧ ذَاتَ (or تَنْقَى ذَاتَ) عَيْنِهِ. For ذَاتَ مِمَّنْ نَنْقَى ذَاتَ (تَنْقَى ذَاتَ) عَيْنِهِ, "the contents (i.e. the look) of his eye," cf. p. 615, v. ١٢, and *Nagd'id*, glossary, under ذُو.  
 315 ٢٠ فِي حَنَادِجِ خَرَّةٍ.  
 316 ٢١ Read وَجَالِسِ أَبْوَابِ الْخُدُورِ. This verse continues the enumeration begun in v. ١٧. بِعَيْنِهِ الْخِ, "on account of whose eye the lover who snatches a glance is in the utmost fear."  
 316, gloss on v. ٢٢, first line. مِنْكِينَاتِ for مَكْنَنَاتِ or أَمَكْنَنَاتِ.  
 320 ٣٨ مُرَاعَاتِكَ, second object of لَا تَحْسِبِي in v. ٣٦.  
 322 ٤٥ وَيُعْرِضَنَّ.  
 596 ١٢ جُرْعَ.  
 617 ٢١ وَحَوْزًا.  
 618 ٢٨ فَارَقَ for فَارَقَ.  
 622 ٤٦ إِنَّ يَنْهَضَ.

Dhu 'r-Rummah, who ranked high as an authority on Bedouin idiom, is frequently cited by the philologists. We appreciate the labour devoted to collecting these citations, but wish that space could have been found for a glossary of uncommon words and for an index of rhymes. In fact the indices scarcely do justice to this notable edition, which, apart from its own merits, will always stand as a monument of Mr. Macartney's enthusiasm, energy, and endurance.

R. A. N.

---



## OBITUARY NOTICE

---

### LEONARD WILLIAM KING

It is with the feeling that the world of letters has suffered a great loss in the death of my late colleague and friend, Leonard William King, that I write this short appreciation of him. Those who knew him personally will never forget his genial presence, his kindly manner; those who were acquainted with him through his books will realize what the loss is to Oriental scholarship.

Born in 1869 he was educated at Rugby, where he obtained a scholarship, and got his cap at football. Going thence to King's College, Cambridge, he took a first in the Theological Tripos, and had he not changed his mind during his undergraduate days he would have gone into the Church. Science was, however, the gainer by his entering the Egyptian and Assyrian Department at the British Museum in 1892, where he remained until his death. He was made an Assistant Keeper in 1913, and a lecturer in Assyrian in 1910 at King's College, London, where he was subsequently elected professor. He obtained his Litt.D. at Cambridge early in his career. He was on the Council of this Society. In 1906 he married Anna, daughter of the late Henry Anthony Burke, a descendant of Edmund Burke, the politician.

After war broke out he put his knowledge of the Near East at the service of the Admiralty, who employed him in map construction in London. Then, when the stress of war in Mesopotamia had diminished and the British Museum had set on foot fresh explorations in that country which I had been ordered to begin, he was to have joined me there and taken over the work from my hands. But alas! the effect of inoculation against typhoid upon

a system already weakened by dysentery, from which he had suffered in his work at Nineveh in 1904, was followed by influenza from which he never really recovered, and a chill carried him off, just when he was in a fair way to mend.

To appreciate his work to the full is no easy task for one of his own generation. He was an extraordinarily good, neat, and accurate copyist of cuneiform, and his texts (in these days when there is so much eye-trying work published in America and Germany) were a pleasure to read. He was always a pioneer in his editions of texts; his Letters of Hammurabi marked a distinct period of English Assyriology, and his work on the Tablets of Creation embodied so much fresh material that the world was introduced almost to a new story. His *magnum opus*, the History, of which two volumes were published, shows every evidence of that care and wide reading essential to him who breaks new ground.

It was his love of adventure which first led him to Mesopotamia at his own expense to reconnoitre the ground for reopening excavation at Kouyunjik, whither he returned and dug on behalf of the Museum for more than a year. To his recommendation to the Museum Authorities I owe in great measure my first journey to the Tigris valley; and after I had joined him in 1904 we crossed into Persia together to recopy the great inscription of Darius at Behistun, and no man could have wished for a pleasanter or more energetic companion. It was the practical side of his nature which made him so keen and efficient a traveller, and, it may also be added, such a determined one. This showed itself in the sensible and judicious opinions expressed in his scientific work.

R. CAMPBELL THOMPSON.

---

# NOTES OF THE HALF-YEAR

(July–December, 1919)

---

## GENERAL MEETINGS OF THE ROYAL ASIATIC SOCIETY

*November 11, 1919.*—Sir Charles J. Lyall, K.C.S.I., Vice-President, in the Chair.

The following thirty-three candidates were elected members of the Society :—

Pandit G. L. Chaturvedi.	Agha Hyder Hosain.
Mr. R. N. Banerji, B.Sc.	Mr. Halodhur Roy, Zamindar.
Babu Shivaprasad Gupta.	Mr. Israel Abrahams, M.A., D.D.
Captain Vere Everard Turner.	Mrs. Agnes H. T. Marsh
Mrs. Cousland.	Phillipps de Lisle, F.R.G.S.
R. Prasada, A.C.I., F.R.U.S.	Lieut.-Com. V. L. Trumper.
Mr. S. N. Edwardes, C.S.I.,	Pandit B. D. Sharman, B.A.
C.V.O.	Dr. A. S. Yahuda.
Mr. N. M. Penzer, B.A., F.G.S.	The Rev. Prof. S. A. B. Mercer,
Professor T. R. Seshayyengar.	Ph.D., D.D.
The Rev. F. W. O'Connell,	Mr. A. M. Hocart.
M.A., B.D., Litt.D.	Mr. Sayyid H. Majid.
Mr. Charles E. Ball.	Mr. K. Krishnamachariar, B.A.
Mr. S. Abdul Majid, B.A.	Mr. M. Mohan Dhar, M.A.
Mr. B. B. Bihari Lal, B.A.,	Dr. George Morgenstierne.
L.L.B.	Mr. B. Debi Prasad.
The Rev. Sydney Nicholson.	Mr. Ram Chandra.
Sardar Abdul Qadir Khan.	Mrs. Satyanathan, M.A.
The Rev. Leo Jung.	Diwan A. A. Sharar, B.A.

An address on recent Historical and Archæological work in India was delivered by Dr. Vincent A. Smith, C.I.E., Vice-President. He said :—

A fortunate combination of circumstances enables us to mark our last meeting in these familiar rooms by two interesting ceremonies well adapted to do honour



to the occasion. In the ordinary course of the Society's history the Public Schools Medal would have been presented to Mr. Bajpai some months ago, but his absence in India made a postponement necessary. The Pinhey Memorial Medal is presented here to Mr. Cousens at the request of the Hyderabad Archæological Society. My personal association with both ceremonies is close. I was, as usual, one of the examiners for the Society's Medal, and was entrusted by the Hyderabad Archæological Society with the adjudication of the first Pinhey Memorial Medal. The Council, therefore, have thought that it might be in my power to offer some brief observations appropriate to the special business of the meeting and likely to interest the Society generally.

Inasmuch as my first essay in Indian History was published forty-two years ago, I could say much concerning the wonderful advances made in my favourite studies during my life, but time will not permit me either to indulge in a general review or to go into details.

The establishment by Lord Curzon of a reformed Archæological Society, directed so admirably by Sir John Marshall, has been a most potent factor in securing the progress achieved in every branch of Indian Archæology and History. Eight years ago the Government of India was foolish enough to express the opinion that the work of the Survey was substantially complete, and that the cost of continuing it might be saved. Vigorous protests rescued the organization, and it must be obvious now to the Government of India that the subject-matter on which the Survey works is practically inexhaustible.

Little has yet been done in the exploration of the sites dating from remote antiquity. The most important task of that kind as yet undertaken is the series of excavations begun by Sir John Marshall, and well

described by him in the *Guide to Taxila*, 1918. But the oldest of the three cities collectively known as Taxila has not yet been excavated. When the Bhīr mound shall be seriously attacked we may expect startling discoveries concerning both the Mauryas of the fourth and third centuries B.C. and their predecessors.

A century ago scholars were disposed to attribute an excessive antiquity to Indian literature and civilization. The inevitable reaction against extravagant theories resulted in a tendency to modernize the dates too much. If, as Goldstücker believed—and I have always agreed with him—the matchless grammarian Pāṇini lived not later than 600 B.C., the antiquity of Indian literature must be put back many centuries earlier. As Professor Radhakumud Mukherjee has shown in a paper offered to our Journal, the Sanskrit literature anterior to Pāṇini was extensive and varied. The general civilization of North India necessarily must be of early date when the literature is old. I say nothing about the Dravidian south, a separate and enormous subject.

Several Hindu scholars have addressed themselves to the difficult problems relating to the Nandas and other dynasties in the north preceding the Mauryas, and a certain amount of solid progress has been achieved. The remarkable Patna statues noticed at the Joint Meeting of the Asiatic Societies in September may not be as old as Mr. Jayaswal supposes, but I am convinced that they are not later than Asoka.

The date of Kanishka is a problem which has occupied from time to time many pages of our Journal, and has given rise to much discussion. The old question as to the Kadphises kings having preceded Kanishka has been settled definitely in the affirmative by Sir John Marshall's excavations at Taxila. The positive date of Kanishka still remains more or less an open question, but I am now satisfied that it must be placed about A.D. 120,

a date which I adopted many years ago on grounds not altogether satisfactory, but which is defensible at this time for other reasons.

When the chronology of the Nandas and that of Kanishka shall be finally adjusted, as they must be before long, the historian will be able to write with considerable confidence a fairly consecutive history of North India from 600 or even 700 B.C.

Coming down to later periods we find a multitude of students working hard at innumerable problems. For instance, Professor Krishnaswami Ayyangar, of Madras University, is busy at the history of the mediaeval Hindu empire of Vijayanagar, which was broken up in 1565. He has published this year a valuable collection of materials under the title *Sources of Vijayanagar History*.

Lieut.-Colonel Haig continues to do scholarly work on the Muhammadan dynasties of the Deccan, and hopes to develop his studies more systematically when he retires next year. At present he is serving as Consul-General in Persia. He is the editor of the Muhammadan section of the composite *Cambridge History of India*, which should have been published long ago but for the War. The project, however, has not been abandoned, and we may all hope for its early and complete realization. The work is to be on a large scale in six volumes.

The critical labours of Professor Jadunath Sarkar deserve special mention. His unfinished history of Aurangzeb, the last of the great Moguls, is based on an enormous collection of unpublished material, and is a work of high importance. The same learned author has not been afraid to handle the highly explosive subject of the *Life and Times of Shivaji*, the Maratha leader, which he has treated with skill and impartiality.

The industry of some writers is appalling. I have been reading lately the type-written MS. of a work on

Hindu Polity, in which the writer states incidentally that he examined 1,150 MSS. in London alone.

I have been asked to invite your attention to the excellence of the results achieved by the many Societies which have sprung up in India during recent years. They are numerous, but my remarks will be confined to four, of which I receive the publications.

The earliest of the four is the Panjab Historical Society, founded in 1910 by Dr. Vogel and certain members of the Panjab University. Sir Edward Maclagan, the new Lieutenant-Governor, is an active patron and supporter. The thoughtless action of a German U-boat has spoiled my set, but the numbers which I possess amply entitle the Society to a high place in the annals of research. The Journal is published in an attractive form in large quarto.

The Bihar and Orissa Research Society, which issued the first volume of its Journal for 1915, is a good second, and might urge claims to the first rank among the new Societies. It, too, is fortunate in enjoying the patronage and skilled guidance of the head of the Province, Sir Edward Gait, the historian of Assam. The editing by Messrs. Jayaswal and R. D. Banerji of the great inscription of Khāravela, king of Kalinga or Orissa, is the most notable achievement of the Society. The numerous articles on anthropology and prehistoric antiquities give a special note to its publications.

The weakest of the new institutions, I am sorry to say, is the Historical Society of the Upper Provinces, whose Journal made its appearance in September, 1917. The support of Sir Harcourt Butler, the present Lieutenant - Governor, may infuse new life into the Society, which, with efficient organization and an active Secretary, should be inferior to none. Three or four of the papers in the three parts published are of high merit. The form is a large octavo.

The Hyderabad Archæological Society, founded in 1915, is fortified by the ample resources of the Government of His Exalted Highness the Nizam. Their Journal, handsomely printed in large octavo, with wide margins, is attractively illustrated. The Secretary, Mr. G. Yazdani, has proved his capacity both as editor of the Journal and as Superintendent of the Archæological Survey of the Nizam's Dominions. A letter by the late Dr. Moulton on the so-called Zoroastrian Period in Indian History gives somewhat unexpected support to Dr. Spooner's audacious theories, familiar to the readers of our Journal. The unexplored material in the Deccan is unlimited, and the Society has reason to expect a long and prosperous career.

The first President was Sir Alexander Pinhey, K.C.S.I., then the Resident at Hyderabad. When he died in 1916, at an early age, the Society resolved to perpetuate his memory by establishing the Pinhey Memorial Medal. The regulations, settled in April, 1917, provide for a triennial award for "the best work on Deccan Archæology or History". The competition is "open to scholars in any part of the world".

The Society honoured me by entrusting me with the adjudication for the first award. Four competitors sent in treatises. Two of them were negligible. The third, an essay by a Hindu scholar on the prehistoric antiquities of the Deccan, was good as far as it went, and elicited the commendation of Dr. Marett, who examined it. But that essay lacked the indispensable illustrations, and was rather an outline sketch than a finished treatise. The fourth, the magnificent work now before you on *Bijapur and its Architectural Remains*, by Mr. Henry Cousens (vol. xxxvii, Imp. Ser., A.S., Bombay Government Press, 1916), obviously had the highest claim to the Medal, which I had no hesitation in awarding to the author. The book supersedes all previous works on

the subject, and leaves little to be said by anybody else. The illustrations, both drawings and photographs, are superbly produced and give a vivid idea of the glories of the ancient capital, which, after a long period of desolation, is now reviving as a modern commercial town.

Mr. Cousens held the office of Superintendent of the Archæological Survey (Western Circle) for about twenty years, and issued annual Progress Reports, which show, as they ought to show, gradual advance in both matter and method. Those Reports, indispensable to the student of ancient Indian history, contain the records of important discoveries in Sind, at Chitōr, at Besnagar, and at scores of other localities. The good work of Mr. Cousens is fitly crowned by the award of the Pinhey Memorial Medal, which I ask the Chairman to hand to him, with the best wishes both of this Society and of its young daughter, the Archæological Society of Hyderabad.

Mr. H. COUSENS, having accepted the Medal, replied in the following terms:—

I would just like to explain how my monograph on Bijapur came to be written. It is one of five monographs which I undertook to write for the Government of India on my retirement from the service. Three others are already completed and are in India awaiting the printer. Their publication was postponed on account of the necessity for economy during the War, but I hope to see them shortly put through the press.

One is upon the *Chalukyan Architecture of the Bombay Presidency*; another upon the *Mediaeval Temples of the Dakhan*; and a third, which I think will prove of more interest to a larger circle of readers, is upon the *Antiquities of Sind*. The fifth monograph I have now in hand, but my progress with it is slow, owing chiefly to the house shortage, all my books being warehoused and, for the time being, inaccessible. It is upon the famous

temple of Somanātha and other mediaeval temples in Kathiawad.

The publication of these volumes will round off the work of many years of the Archæological Survey of Western India. When the late Dr. Burgess started the Survey he wrote and issued illustrated annual reports of the operations in the field. But this method was found unsatisfactory, as these reports merely described the remains as they were met with during the annual cold weather tours, without reference to others of the same classes elsewhere. There would be, for instance, an account of some Brahmanical temple, followed by that of a Buddhist cave, and that, again, by some Muhammadan remains, and so on. It was then determined to abandon this method, and wait until we had collected sufficient material to produce more or less complete monographs on each of the different classes met with.

As we then settled down for some years, almost exclusively to the rock-cut cave-temples, it was not long before Dr. Burgess was able to produce two volumes upon these, which, with the *Cave-temples of India*, written in conjunction with Mr. Fergusson, practically exhausted this subject. The old city of Dabhoi, in His Highness the Gaikwad's dominions; the mosques and tombs of Ahmadabad; the Muhammadan remains in other parts of Gujarat; and the Solanki architecture of Northern Gujarat supplied materials for further monographs. In place of the original illustrated yearly reports we now issue brief annual Progress Reports, chiefly for the information of Government, without illustrations, which record, with short descriptive paragraphs, the work accomplished during the year, and include the usual office returns concerning the staff, expenditure, etc.

Then followed a great impetus in the work of the conservation of these remains, which curtailed original exploration, and banished any chance of our undertaking

the sorting out of the material we had in hand and its publication. Thus it came about that when the time came for me to retire we had a very great collection of drawings, photographs, copies of epigraphical records, notes, and other material dealing with the classes of remains I am now finishing off. As the collection of all this material had been my work for many years before quitting the Survey, the Government of India arranged with me to write up these monographs after my retirement, when I should be released from office routine and other extraneous duties.

With the completion of these, pretty well all remains above ground, and a little from below, in the Western Presidency and adjoining districts, will have been examined and described. As the architectural remains above ground were, for the most part, fast decaying, we delayed regular excavation work until these had been visited and surveyed. What was below ground would keep for a while longer, but much of that above was crumbling fast.

In the Western Presidency proper there is little below ground, for the simple reason that most of the country is rock to the surface, or very near it, so that there has been little chance for remains to become covered. Sind, however, offers a more inviting field for excavation, as may be gathered from the very satisfactory results of my excavations at Mirpur-Khas and those of Mr. Bhandarkar near Tando Muhammad Khan. To my great regret the age limit of the Service, making me too old to remain longer in the traces, though not too old to work up these monographs, obliged me to quit just when I should have liked to follow up this very congenial and interesting work of excavation. I believe there is more underground in Sind, through which Alexander once led his armies, than we have any idea of. The ever-shifting Indus and its tributaries have played havoc with its old sites, and



have, in the long past, caused many a town to be abandoned, and subsequently covered with silt and sand.

The principal remains in Western India comprise a few localities where prehistoric flints, dolmens, and cairns are to be found; the magnificent series of rock-cut temples of the Buddhists, Hindus, and Jains; the Buddhist remains in Sind, chiefly below ground; the mediaeval temples of Gujarat, and those of the Dakhan and the Chalukyan or Kanarese districts, each of these three classes being of distinct styles; the Muhammadan remains in the principal centres of Sind, Ahmadabad, Champanir, and Bijapur, with others scattered all over the country; and lastly, certain European remains, principally Portuguese, such as are found within the old fort of Bassein, near Bombay.

In addition to these, are the old mediaeval forts of the Dakhan, found in scores perched upon the hills and crags of the Western Ghats. These and countless epigraphical remains constitute the chief stock-in-trade of our Department in Western India.

When the Survey was first started the Bombay Government expected that it would have completed its work of the Presidency in a few short years, but after several reminders as the years went on, and finding that they could not get rid of us, they made the Survey into a permanent and ornamental department which still finds plenty of work to do.

There is one subject upon which I should like to say a few words. It has been proposed that all appointments in the Archæological Department of India should be filled with Sanskritists. Apart from the Sanskrit Epigraphists, this is not at all necessary. The collection of epigraphical records is a small part of a superintendent's duties. His chief work lies with monumental archæology and excavation, and, to carry out this work properly—to supervise and check his draftsmen or surveyors—it is absolutely necessary that he should know more of their

work than they do themselves, for they are not always to be depended upon for accuracy, which plays so important a part in all exploration. He has to make proposals for conservation work to be carried out by the P.W.D., and unless he has himself some architectural and building knowledge he is not likely to command the same respect at their hands. It is therefore necessary that the Superintendent should be an architect or engineer. Again, since the epigraphical records collected are not by any means confined to Sanskrit inscriptions, he would, in order to work satisfactorily on these himself, have to be a fully qualified scholar in each of the different languages. Life is too short for one to be qualified in all these subjects. So we have found it better for a Superintendent not to dabble in epigraphical records himself, but to pass on his impressions and estampages to our own epigraphists or to those scholars in India or Europe whose life studies in the different languages enable them to do that part of the work much more thoroughly. Years ago I started the study of Sanskrit, Persian, and Kanarese, but soon found I had not the time for it. It is as well, though, for a Superintendent to make himself so far acquainted with the different languages as to be able to pick out names and dates so as to judge the age and character used, and so be able to decide whether an inscription is a valuable one or not.

The next business of the meeting was the Presentation of the Royal Asiatic Society's Public School Gold Medal to Mr. S. S. Bajpai, late of Dulwich College, for his essay on "The Emperor Shah Jahan, 1627-66". The Chairman said that it was the first occasion on which the Gold Medal had been won by a young Indian gentleman. Though only two essays had been sent in, they were both of a high order of merit and it had been decided to award a second prize of books to the other competitor, Mr. R. G. Thurnburn, of St. Paul's School, Hammersmith.

The prizes having been handed to the recipients, the Chairman, Sir Charles J. Lyall, gave a short address. He communicated the contents of a letter from the President, Lord Reay, expressing his regret that an attack of bronchitis detained him in Scotland and made it impossible for him to be present at this last meeting of the Society at 22 Albemarle Street. The resignation of Sir H. Mortimer Durand, P.C., K.C.M.G., from his position as Director was also announced, and was received with great regret.

The Chairman went on to say that this was the last occasion on which the Society would meet in these rooms which had been occupied by them for exactly fifty years, and in which so much good work had been done. It was in 1869 that they entered them. Their then President was Viscount Strangford, one of the most extraordinary Oriental scholars of his time. They had since had several Presidents, of whom perhaps the most famous was Sir Henry Rawlinson, who was rightly considered the father of Assyriological studies. He was followed by other eminent men, such as Sir Bartle Frere, Sir Henry Yule, and the present President, Lord Reay, who has held the position for no less than twenty-five years—(cheers)—or exactly half the period of their occupancy of the present rooms. Lord Reay desired him to say how glad he was that they had found in their new quarters at 74 Grosvenor Street, a good home in which to continue an active career. That home was now in the hands of the workmen, and of course in great disorder. It was a fine house and it had a number of rooms which would not only lodge them and their library, but would provide space for a good many of the clients who came to them for accommodation. They had had happy times at 22 Albemarle Street, and a great number of eminent men had served on their Council, lectured to their audiences, and contributed to their Journal. As they

knew, their centenary was approaching, for the Society was founded in 1823. In the historical volume by which the event would be commemorated, there would be found many names which had become household words among Orientalists, but on this occasion it would be too long a task to endeavour to enumerate them.

Entering a new building was a time for recognizing that the Society was greatly in need of new blood. If they looked at the list of members of Council they would find a great proportion of old men. They wanted new men, young men, men who would give their best energies in the prime of life to Oriental studies. He sincerely hoped that after a great war, a large part of which had been waged in Eastern lands, there would arise from sojourn in the Near and Further East new students and scholars, who would have been attracted by the things they saw there, and would use the Society for carrying on their work. One more point called for notice: the business of getting out of one house and into another was extremely expensive and it was going far to exhaust their accumulations. He ventured to suggest that some of the older men among their members might consider whether benefactions *inter vivos*, or even if they preferred of a testamentary character, might not be applied to the replenishment of those vanishing accumulations. All of them were attached to a habitation which had so many happy associations for them, and it was with regret that they departed from its friendly shelter. They hoped that in their new quarters they would find more room, and would have a prosperous beginning of a new career.

---



## ADDITIONS TO THE LIBRARY

---

### BOOKS

- Anesaki, M.** Nicheren, the Buddhist Prophet. *Cambridge*, 1916. *From the Author.*
- Arendonk, C. van.** De opkomst van het Zaidietische Imamaat in Yemen. *Leiden*, 1919. *From the Publishers.*
- Ayyangar, S. K.** Sources of Vijayanagar History. The Madras University Historical Series. Selected and edited for the University. *Madras*, 1919. *From the Syndicate University of Madras.*
- Bannerjea, D. N.** Indian Nation Builders. *London*, 1919. *From the Publishers.*
- Bhandarkar, D. R.** Lectures on the Ancient History of India on the Period from 650 to 325 B.C. The Carmichael Lectures, 1918. *Calcutta*, 1919. *From the University of Calcutta.*
- Bhattacharya, B. C.** A documentary History of Sarnath. Plates. *Calcutta*. *From the Author.*
- BIHAR AND ORISSA.** Report on the Administration, 1917-18. *Patna*, 1919. *From the Secretary of State.*
- BURMA ARCHÆOLOGICAL SURVEY.** Report of the Superintendent for the year ending March 31, 1919. *Rangoon*. *From the Government of Burma.*
- CALCUTTA UNIVERSITY COMMISSION REPORT.** 5 vols. 1917-19. Analysis of Present Conditions, chapters i-xxix. Recommendations of the Commission, chapters xxx-liv. *Calcutta*, 1919. *From the Government of India.*
- Cave, S.** Redemption, Hindu and Christian. The Religious Quest of India. *London*, 1919. *From the Publishers.*

- Chanda, Ramaprasad.** Dates of the Votive Inscriptions on the Stupas at Sanchi. No. 1. Memoirs of the Archaeological Survey of India. *Calcutta*, 1919.  
*From the Government of India.*
- Cheng, Sih-Gung.** Modern China. A Political Study. *Oxford*, 1919.  
*From the Publishers.*
- Couling, S.** The Encyclopædia Sinica.  
*Presented by Dr. A. E. Wynter.*
- Cross, E. B.** Dictionary of the Sgaw Karen Language. Compiled by J. Wade, assisted by Mrs. S. K. Bennett. Recompiled and revised. *Rangoon*, 1896. *Bought.*
- DARAH BHARATA.** Verzamling von Hoofdpersonen Uit de Wajangpoerwa. Serie No. 426. Coloured plates. *Batavia*, 1919.  
*From Commissie voor de Volkslectuur.*
- DASTUR HOSHANG MEMORIAL VOLUME**, being papers on Iranian Subjects written by various scholars. *Bombay*, 1918.  
*From Parsee Punchayet Funds.*
- Dhar, M. M.** Krishna the Charioteer. *London*, 1919.  
— Krishna the Cowherd. *London*, 1917.  
*From the Author.*
- DISTRICT GAZETTEERS OF THE UNITED PROVINCES.** B. Vol. Fyzabad Division. *Allahabad*, 1915.  
*From the Government of India.*
- Enriquez, Major C. M.** Kachin Military Terms. *Rangoon*, 1919.  
*From the Government of Burma.*
- Ghose, Nagendranath.** Comparative Administrative Law. Tagore Law Lectures. 1918. *Calcutta*, 1919.  
*From Senate of the Calcutta University.*
- Grierson, Sir George A.** The Linguistic Survey of India and the Census of 1911. *Calcutta*, 1919. *From the Author.*
- HINDU AND BUDDHIST MONUMENTS.** Annual Progress Report of the Superintendent. Northern Circle. Year ending March 31, 1918. *Lahore*, 1918.  
*From the Government of India.*

INDIAN HISTORICAL RECORDS COMMISSION. Proceedings of the first Meeting held in Simla June, 1919.

*From the Government of India.*

Jeffery, George. A brief description of the Holy Sepulchre, Jerusalem, and other Christian Churches in the Holy City. Cambridge, 1919.

*From the Publishers.*

Kaegi, Adolf. Festgabe von Schülern u. Freunden dargebracht zum September 30, 1919. Frauenfeld, 1919.

*From the Publishers.*

Langdon, S. Le Poème Sumérien du Paradis, du Déluge, et de la Chute de l'Homme. Traduit de l'Anglais par Ch. Virolleaud. Plates. Paris, 1919.

*From the Author.*

Lesquier, Jean. L'Armée romaine d'Égypte d'Auguste à Dioclétien. Mémoires publiés par les Membres de l'Institut Français d'Archéologie Orientale du Caire. Tome xli. 2 vols. Le Caire, 1918.

*From the Ministère de l'Instruction Publique et des Beaux Arts.*

Lyall, Sir Charles. The Poems of 'Amr son of Qami'ah of the Clan of Qais son of Tha'labah, a Branch of the Tribe of Bakr son of Wā'il. Edited and translated. Cambridge, 1919.

*Two copies, from the Editor and Publishers.*

Majumdar, R. C. Corporate Life in Ancient India. Calcutta, 1918.

*From the Publishers.*

Maspero, G. Introduction à l'étude de la Phonétique Égyptienne. Paris, 1919.

*Presented by Professor Edouard Naville.*

Perera, H. S. and Daniel Jones. A Colloquial Sinhalese Reader. Manchester University Press, 1919.

*From the Publishers.*

Prasantamurti, J. K. Gospel Gleanings of Universal Religion. Madras, 1918.

*From the Author.*

PROCEEDINGS OF THE SOCIETY OF ANTIQUARIES OF LONDON, November 22, 1917, to June 27, 1918. Second Series. Vol. xxx. Index and plates.

*From the Society of Antiquaries.*



RECORDS OF FORT ST. GEORGE. Letters to Fort St. George, 1686-7. Vol. iv. *Madras*, 1919.

*From the Government of India.*

— Letters from Fort St. George, 1697. Vol. vii. *Madras*, 1919.

*From the Government of India.*

REPORT OF THE BRITISH ASSOCIATION FOR THE ADVANCEMENT OF SCIENCE, 1918. *John Murray*, 1919.

*From the British Association.*

Rivoira, G. T. Moslem Architecture: its Origin and Developments. Translated from the Italian by G. McN. Rushforth. Plates. *Oxford*, 1918.

*From the Delegates of the Clarendon Press.*

Sachau, E. Die Chronik von Arbela. *Berlin*, 1915.

— Zur Ausbreitung des Christentums in Asien. Abhandlungen des Preussischen Akademie der Wissenschaften. *Berlin*, 1919.

*From the Author.*

Sarkar, Jadunath. Shivaji and his Times. *London*, 1919.

*From the Publishers.*

Schindler, Bruno. Das Priestertum im Alten China. 1. Teil: Königtum u. Priestertum im Alten China. Einleitung u. Quellen. *Leipzig*, 1919.

*From the Author.*

Sharp, H. Notes on Vernacular Education in Ceylon. Bureau of Education, India. Pamphlet No. 5. *Calcutta*, 1919.

*From the Government of India.*

Siddiqi, A. Studien über die Persischen Fremdwörter im klassischen Arabisch. *Göttingen*, 1919. *From the Author.*

Singh, Rai Bahadur B. H. Customary Law of the Jullundur District. Vol. xxix. *Lahore*, 1918.

*From the Secretary of State.*

Slater, Gilbert. Economic Studies. University of Madras. Edited by G. S. Vol. i: Some South Indian Villages. Index and plates. *Oxford University Press*, 1918.

*From the Publishers.*

Trench, C. G. Chenevix. Grammar of Gondi as spoken in the Betul District, Central Provinces, India, with Vocabulary,

Folk-tales, Stories, and Songs of the Gonds. Vol. i :  
Grammar. Madras, 1919. *From the Author.*

UNIVERSITY COLLEGE. Abridged Calendar. Session 1919-20.  
*From the University of London.*

UNIVERSITY OF MADRAS. Calendar for 1919. 2 vols. Madras,  
1919.

— Examination Papers set during the Academic year 1918.  
Madras, 1918. *From the India Office.*

Waley, Arthur. Japanese Poetry. The 'Uta'. Oxford,  
1919. *From the Delegates of the Clarendon Press.*

PAMPHLETS

Crabtree, Rev. W. A. Bantu Speech: A Philological Study.  
Reprinted from the Journal of the African Society, 1919.

Douglas, Rev. J. A. The Redemption of Saint Sophia. London,  
1919. *From the Greek Bureau of Foreign Information.*

Kahil Bey, J. M. N. Syriens et Arabes envisagés sous le  
rapport des faits qui les différencient. Cairo, 1919.  
*From the Author.*

Kaviraj, Gopinath. A Catalogue of Sanskrit Manuscripts  
acquired for the Government Sanskrit Library, Sarasvati  
Bhavana, Benares (during the year 1918-19). Allahabad,  
1919. *From the Government of India.*

Moreland, W. H. The Agricultural Statistics of Akbar's  
Empire. Reprint from Journal of Historical Society.  
*From the Author.*

Peserico, Luigi. Cronologia Egiziana verificata astronomicamente  
e confrontata con le altre cronologie antiche.  
Vicenza, 1919. *From the Publishers.*

POËMATIS ETRUSCI, quod Mummia dicitur interpretatio.  
*From the Publishers.*

SANSKRIT AND HINDI MANUSCRIPTS, purchased by order of  
Government and deposited in the Sanskrit College, Benares,  
during the year 1917-18. Allahabad, 1919.  
*From the Government of India.*

**Stein, Sir Aurel.** Marco Polo's Account of a Mongol inroad into Kashmir. From the *Geographical Journal*, August, 1919. *From the Author.*

**Trumper, Victor L.** Historical Sites in Southern, Central, and Northern Palestine. In 4 parts. Maps. *Cairo*, 1917-18. These pamphlets contain brief Notes on Historical and Legendary Sites, adapted for Soldiers. Ed. *From the Author.*

**Wesendonk, O. G. v.** Zarathustra. Sonderabdruck aus *Der neue Orient*. *Berlin*, 1919. *From the Author.*

#### PERIODICALS

Académie des Inscriptions et Belles-lettres. Comptes rendus des Séances de l'année. Bulletin de Janvier-Février, 1919.

Al-Machriq, 1914. No. x.

American Journal of Archæology. Second Series. Vol. xxiii, No. i, January-March, 1919.

—, Vol. xxiii, No. iii, July-September, 1919.

American Oriental Society Journal, vol. xxxix, pt. iv, October, 1919.

Clark (W. E.). Śākadvīpa and Śvetadvīpa.

Peters (J. P.). The Home of the Semites.

Fay (E. W.). The Vedic Postterius-*pitvam*, Cover (night).

Prince (J. D.). Phonetic Relations in Sumerian.

Annales de la Société Royale d'Archéologie de Bruxelles.

Mémoires, Rapports, et Documents. Tome xxviii.

Speleers (Louis). Un cylindre néo-babylonien.

Archives d'Études Orientales. Vol. xv, i.

Karlgren (B.). Études sur la Phonologie Chinoise.

Asiatic Review. Vol. xv, No. xlv, October, 1919.

Douie (Sir J. McC.). The Races of the Panjab.

Waley (A.). The Poet Li Po.

Asiatic Society of Bengal. Journal and Proceedings. New Series. Vol. xv, 1919, No. 3.

Law (B. C.). A Note on Buddhaghosa's Commentaries.

- Law (B. C.). Influence of the five heretical teachers on Jainism and Buddhism.
- Kaye (G. R.). Ancient Hindu Spherical Astronomy.
- Asiatic Society of Bengal. Memoirs. Vol. vi, pts. iv, v ; vol. vii, Nos. i, ii.
- Grierson (Sir G. A.). The Ōrmurī of Bargistā Language. An account of a little-known Eranian Dialect.
- Vol. vii, No. ii.
- Atti della R. Accademia dei Lincei, anno cccxy, 1918, serie quinta. Vol. xv, fasc. 7<sup>o</sup>-9<sup>o</sup>.
- Bataviaasch Genootschap van Kunsten en Wetenschappen. Faille (P. de R. de la). Iets over oud-Batavia. Populair-Wetenschappelijke, Serie No. i.
- Rapporten van den ondheidkundigen Dienst in Nederlandsch-Indië, 1915. Tweede deel.
- Verbeek (R. D. M.). Inventaris der Hindoeondheden van Java.
- Verhandelingen. Deel lxi, 5.
- Stort (P. van G.). Nederlandsch - Tidoengsch - Tinggalan Dajaksche Woordenlijst.
- Deel lxi, 6.
- Wielenga (D. K.). Vergelijkende Woordenlijst der Verschillende dialecten op het eiland Soemba en eeinge Soembaneesche Spreekwijzen.
- Notulen. Deel liii, 1915, afl. 4 ; Deel liv, 1916, afl. 1-4 ; Deel lv, 1917, afl. 1-4 ; Deel lvi, 1918, 1-4 ; Deel lvii, 1.
- Ondheidkundig Verslag 1916, 1<sup>te</sup>, 4<sup>de</sup> Kwartaal ; 1917, 2<sup>de</sup>, 3<sup>de</sup>, 4<sup>de</sup> K. ; 1918, 1<sup>te</sup>, 2<sup>de</sup>, 3<sup>de</sup>, 4<sup>de</sup> K. ; 1919, 1<sup>te</sup> K.
- Bijdragen tot de Taal-, land- en Volkenkunde van Nederlandsch-Indië. Deel lxxv, afl. 1-2.
- Ronkel (Ph. S. van). Oud-Javaansche aardrijkskundige Namen verklaard ?
- Krom (N. J.). Epigrafische Bijdragen.
- Kemp (P. H. v. d.). De outslagen gouverneur Van Middelkoop en de schout-bijnacht Buijskes over den opstand in de Molukken van 1817-1818.
- Ceylonsch volksrecht, opgeteekend in 1707.

Bihar and Orissa Research Society Journal. Vol. v, pt. iii,  
September, 1919.

Nahar (P. C.). Rajgir Jain Inscription.

Husain Khan (K. Bahadur S.). Translation of Maharajah  
Kalyan Singh's Khulasat-ut-Tawarikh. II.

Roy (Rai Bahadur S. C.). Social Organization of the Pabri  
Bhinyas (with plate).

Boston Museum of Fine Arts Bulletin. Vol. xvii, No. cii,  
August, 1919.

Rajput Painting. IV. The Kangra Valley.

Bulletin de l'Institut français d'Archéologie Orientale. Tome xiii,  
2<sup>me</sup> fasc.

Read (F. W.). Boats or fortified villages ?

Gauthier (H.). La nécropole de Thebes et son personnel.

Dareassy (A.). Indicateur topographique du *Livre des Perles  
enfouies et du mystère précieux* (avec 3 planches).

— Tome xiv, 1<sup>re</sup> fasc.

Dareassy (G.). Indicateur topographique du *Livre des Perles  
enfouies et du mystère précieux (suite et fin)*.

Lammens (H.). L'Ancienne frontière entre la Syrie et le  
Hidjâz (notes de géographie historique).

— Tome xiv, 2<sup>me</sup> fasc.

Kuentz (Ch.). Deux points de Syntaxe égyptienne.

— Tome xv, 1<sup>re</sup> fasc.

Gauthier (H.). Répertoire pharaonique pour servir d'index  
au *Livre des Rois d'Égypte*.

— Tome xv, 2<sup>me</sup> fasc.

Chalelet (Marie). Le rôle des deux barques solaires.

Jéquier (G.). Quelques objets appartenant au rituel funéraire  
sous le Moyen Empire.

Combe (É.). Notes d'Archéologie Musulmane.

— Tome xvi, fasc. 1.

Weill (R.). Les ports antéhelléniques de la côte d'Alexandrie  
et l'Empire crétois. Planche.

Creswell (K. A. C.). A brief Chronology of the Muḥammadan  
Monuments of Egypt to A.D. 1517. Plates.

Calcutta Review. No. ccxcvi, April, 1919.

Dhar (Gokulnath). Crimes in Ancient India.

Dodwell (H.). Madras Nabobs.

Ceylon Antiquary and Literary Register. Vol. v, pt. i, July, 1919.

Trefusis (R.). The Portraits and Coats-of-Arms of Governors of Ceylon at Queen's House.

Mudaliyar (S. S.). Relics of the Portuguese Rule in Jaffna.

Perera (Rev. S. G.). The Jesuits in Ceylon in the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries. (*Continued.*)

Ceylon Branch of the Royal Asiatic Society. Journal. Vol. xxvi, No. lxxi, pt. i, 1918.

Lewis (J. P.). Andrews' Journal of a Tour to Candia in the year 1796. (*Continued.*)

Codrington (H. W.). An Inscription of Gaja Bábu II.

Congrès Français de la Syrie (3, 4, et 5 Janvier, 1919). Séances et Travaux. Fasc. iii, iv.

Daftar Kitab-Kitab jang dikeloewarkan oléh Komisi Balai Poestaka di Weltevreden, Daftar ke 4.

East India Association Journal. Vol. x, No. iv, October, 1919.

Douie (Sir James). Races of the Panjab and North-Western Frontier Provinces: Manners and Religions.

École Française d'Extrême-Orient. Bulletin 18<sup>me</sup> Année. Tome xix, No. i.

Parmentier (Henri). L'Art d'Indravarman.

— 19<sup>me</sup> Année. Tome xix, No. ii.

Cadière (L.). Croyances et Pratiques Religieuses des Annamites dans les Environs de Hué ii-v. Les Pierres.

Epigraphia Indica. Vol. xiv, pt. v, January, 1918.

Sahni (D. R.). Chandravati Plates of Chandra-Deva: V.S. 1150-1156. (*Concluded.*)

Venkateswara (S. V.) and Viswanathan (S. V.). Bevinahalli Grant of Sadsiva Raya: Saka 1473.

— Kudiyantandal Grant of Vira-Nrisimha: Saka 1429.

Epigraphia Indo-Moslemica. 1915-16.

Beveridge (H.). Mahdi *Khawāja*. Plates i-iii.

Yazdani (G.). Two inscriptions of King Husain *Shāh* of Bengal from Tribeni. Plate iv.

Yazdani (G.). Inscriptions in the Tomb of Bābā Arjun *Shāh*, Petlād (Baroda State). Plate xiv.

— Inscriptions in the Golconda Tombs. Plates v-xiii.

— Remarks on the date of a copper-plate inscription of Khandesh.

Geographical Journal. Vol. liv, No. iii, September, 1919.  
Supplement, No. iii, June, 1919.

— Vol. liv, No. iv, October, 1919.

Ward (F. K.). On the possible Prolongation of the Himalayan Axis beyond the Dihang.

— Vol. liv, No. v, November, 1919.

Stein (Sir A.). The Desert Crossing of Hsüan-tsang, 630 A.D.

Geological Survey of India. Records. Vol. xlix, pt. iv; vol. l, pt. i, 1919.

Indian Antiquary. Vol. xlvii, pt. dc, October, 1918.

Smith (V. A.). The Stratagem used by Alexander against Porus, alluded to in the *Āin-i-akbari*.

Bhide (H. B.). Notes on Kālidāsa.

— Vol. xlvii, pt. dci, November, 1918.

Temple (Sir R. C.). Sidelights on Omichund.

Law (N. N.). *Vārttā*—the Ancient Hindu Economics.

Venkatasubbiah (A.). Indrasena.

— Vol. xlvii, pt. dcii, December, 1918.

Venkatasubbiah (A.). The Chronology of the Western Chālukyas of Kalyāni.

Sen (Arun). Mauryana.

Jayaswal (K. P.). Notes on Asoka Inscriptions: the term Ashashu.

Indian Magazine. September, 1919; October, 1919; November, 1919.

Iranian Association Journal. Vol. iii, No. iii, June, 1914;  
Vol. vi, No. viii, November, 1917.

- Journal Asiatique. Tome xii, No. i, Juillet-Août, 1918.  
 Ferrand (Gabriel). Malaka : Le Malāyu et Malāyur (*suite*).  
 — Tome xii, No. ii, Septembre-Octobre, 1918.  
 Bel (M. A.). Inscriptions arabes de Fès (*suite*). Planches.  
 Chabot (M. J.-B.). Glanures palmyréniennes.  
 — Tome xii, No. iii, Novembre-Décembre, 1918.  
 Bel (M. A.). Inscriptions arabes à Fès (*suite*).  
 Przyluski (M.). Le Parinirvāna et les funérailles du Buddha  
 (*suite*).  
 — Onzième Série. Tome xiii, No. i, Janvier-Février, 1919.  
 Bel (M. A.). Inscriptions arabes de Fès (*suite*).  
 Lammens (M. H.). A propos d'un colloque entre le patriarche  
 jacobite Jean I<sup>er</sup> et 'Āmr ibn Al-'Āsi.  
 Journal and Proceedings of the Asiatic Society of Bengal. New  
 Series, Vol. xv, No. ii, 1919.  
 Maha-Bodhi and the United Buddhist World. Vol. xxvii,  
 Nos. iv-vi, April-June, 1919.  
 Mythic Society, Quarterly Journal. Vol. ix, No. iv, July, 1919.  
 Richards (F. J.). Some notes on Marriage and Funeral  
 Customs in Salem District, South India.  
 Gowd (P. N.). The exact Sciences in the Vedas.  
 Rathnaswamy (Prof. M.). The Nomads in India. II.  
 Mirza (R. N. F.). The Great Sage of Persia and his  
 Followers.  
 North China Branch of the Royal Asiatic Society. Journal.  
 Vol. L, 1919.  
 Lobingier (C. S.). The Early Malays and their Neighbours.  
 Ferguson (J. C.). Recent Books by a Chinese Scholar.  
 Numismatic Chronicle. Fourth Series, No. lxxiv, Pt. ii, 1919.  
 Palestine Exploration Fund. October, 1919.  
 Blair (D. P.). Stone Altars and Cup-marks in South  
 Palestine.  
 Patrologia Orientalis. Tome xii, fasc. v.  
 Karapet (Bishop) and Wilson (Rev. S. G.). S. Irenæus.  
 Armenian Version, edited and translated.



*Patrologia Orientalis*. Tome xiii, fasc. ii.

Nau (F.). Textes Syriaques, édités et traduits.

— Tome xiii, fasc. iv.

Addai Scher (Mgr.), avec le concours de R. Griveau. Histoire Nestorienne (Chronique de Séert), 2<sup>me</sup> partie. II.

— Tome xiii, fasc. v.

Pereira (F. M. S.). Le troisième livre de 'Ezra (Sedras et Néhémie canoniques), Version Éthiopienne éditée et traduite en français.

— Tome xiv, fasc. i.

Brooks (E. W.). A collection of Letters of Severus of Antioch from numerous Syriac MSS. Edited and translated.

— Tome xiv, fasc. ii.

Davis (M. H.). The Life of Abba John Khamé. Coptic Text, edited and translated from the Cod. Vat. Copt. lx.

Quest, The. Vol. xi, No. i, October, 1919.

Revue de l'Histoire des Religions. Tome lxxviii, Nos. i-ii, Juillet-Octobre.

Naville (Ed.). La composition et les sources de la Genèse.

Deonna (W.). Questions d'archéologie religieuse et symbolique. XIII.

Alfaric (P.). Les Ecritures manichéennes. IV.

— Tome lxxviii, No. iii, Novembre-Décembre.

Macler (F.). Notes latines sur les Nestoriens, Maronites, Arméniens, Géorgiens, Mozarabes.

Alfaric (P.). Les Ecritures manichéennes. V.

Royal Anthropological Institute Journal. Vol. xlix, January-June, 1919.

Royal Institution of Great Britain, Proceedings. Vol. xxii, pt. i, No. iii.

South Indian Research. Vol. i, February-June, 1919.

Tijdschrift voor Indische Taal-, Land-, en Volkenkunde. Deel lvii, v-vi; Deel lviii, Afl. i-iv (plans), iv-vi.

T'oung (Pao). Vol. xviii, No. iv, v, Octobre et Décembre, 1917.  
d'Elia (P. M.). Un maître de la jeune Chine-Liang K'i-Tch'ao.  
Cordier (H.). Les Correspondants de Bertin.

— Vol. xix, No. i, Mars, 1918-19.

Favre (Commandant). Les Sociétés de "Frères Jurés" en  
Chine.

Travancore Archæological Series. Vol. ii, pt. ii.

Gopinatha Rao (T. A.). Jaina and Bauddha Vestiges in  
Travancore. Illustrated.



# INDEX FOR 1919

- A
- A new Ganga Record, 236-9.  
 Abelson, Joshua, his *Jewish Mysticism*, 103-4 ; his *Immanence of God*, 104 ; his *Maimonides*, 104.  
 Abu'l-Alā Ma'arri, Arabic poet, 449.  
 Académie des Inscriptions, Mémoires of, 241.  
 Ahmed Leki Pasha, his *Ibn-al-Kalbi and Tibr Masbuk*, 607.  
 Aix-la-Chapelle, Peace of, 285.  
 Aiyangar, S. Krishnaswami, his *Beginnings of South Indian History*, 596-9 ; his *Ancient India*, 596.  
 al-Anbāri, his recension of the text of the Mufaḍḍaliyāt, 102.  
 Alexander the Great, 500, 503, 522, 605.  
 Ali, A. Yusuf, his *Track of Indians Kultur*, review of, 277-9.  
 'Alfiyyu'nnu -l- Hasan 'el-Khazrejiyy, *The Pearl-Strings*, review of, 423-7.  
 al-Mufaḍḍal, poet, 102-3.  
 Ambur campaign, 286 seq.  
 Ananda Ranga Pillai, Private Diary of, 285-90.  
 Ancestors, worship of, 509.  
 Ancient Arabic poetry, some aspects of, 102-3.  
 Anderson, G., his *Expansion of British India*, 258-60.  
 "Anglo-Indian," 62-3, 588.  
*Annals of Archaeology*, 34.  
 Anu, Babylonian deity, 203.  
 Apollonius of Tyana, 500.  
*Apsast*, meaning of, 41-2.  
*Ara* = *namāru*, meaning of, 42.  
 Arab traders, 525 ; influences in the Philippines, 586 ; sailors, 601 ; paganism, 607.  
 Arabia, 602 ; poetry of, 102-3 ; dialect of literature in, 103.  
 Arabic word quoted by Hemacandra, 235 ; lexicons, 426 ; literature, recent, 607-12.  
 Aramaic character, documents in, 147-52 ; language, 596.  
 Archaeological Survey of India, Annual Report (1915-16), 104-6 ; Eastern Circle (1916-17), 106, 239 ; Hindu and Buddhist Monuments (Northern Circle), 106-7 ; Memoirs, 396, 427.  
 Archer, William, his *India and the Future* (1917), 62.  
 Aris, sect of, 105-6.  
 Armenian cemetery at Isfahan, 321-52.  
 Artaxerxes, court of, 518.  
 Aryan groups and types, 493, 497, 500, 511 ; earliest notice of, 506 ; N. India Aryanized, 506-7, 524 ; mode of life, 507 ; social structure, 509.  
 — invasion of Northern India, 493-529 ; stages in, 507.  
 Asoka, Rock Edict of, 581, 598 ; his kingdom, 598.  
 Assyrian inscriptions and texts, 290, 296-8. See Babylonian.  
*Astronomical Observations of Jai Singh*, by G. R. Kaye, review of, 427-9.  
 Athé, Dr., 209.  
 Athens, Congress of Orientalists at, 128, 607.  
 Auckland, Lord, 260.  
 Aufrecht, Professor, 125.  
 Avestan texts, 110-13 ; language, 526.
- B
- Babylon, cuneiform script of, 1 ; civilization of, 2 ; early history of, 26 ; inscriptions and tablets, 64, 185-205, 290 ; vegetation of, 204 ; peoples of, 502.  
*Babyloniaca*, Journal of, 588.  
 Babylonian myths and legends, 37, 185, 292-3 ; grammatical text, 38 ; culture in Asia Minor, 589.

- Bagdad, 291-3.  
 Ball, Rev. C. J., 30.  
*Barbosa, Duarte, The Book of*, 401-14.  
 Bargistā language. *See* Ōrmurī.  
 Bar Hebræus's *Book of the Dove*, review of, 593-6.  
 Baroda, music conference at, 276.  
 Basque fire customs, 107.  
*Beginnings of South Indian History*, review of, 596-9.  
 Bell, Miss G. L., *The Desert and the Sown*, 612.  
 Benares, mosque in, 558.  
 Bengal, Asiatic Society of, 116, 119, 274.  
 Berchem, M. van, his *Corpus Inscriptionum*, 611.  
 Bevan, Professor, 620.  
 Beveridge, H., 586.  
 Bhandarkar, Professor D. R., 396.  
 Bharatas, tribe of, 521; kings of, 514.  
 Bharhut, stūpa of, 242.  
 Bhasa and the Matta-vilāsa, plays ascribed to, 233-4.  
 Biblical Archaeology, Society of, 25-36, 129; Proceedings and Transactions, 28-9, 185; amalgamated with the Royal Asiatic Society, 36.  
 Biddulph, Colonel, 288.  
 Bihār and Orissa, province of, 239; Journal of Research Society, 395; races of, 502, 522-4.  
 Birch, Dr. Samuel, 25-7, 29, 35.  
 Birdwood, Sir George, 417.  
 Bi-Sitūn, inscription at, 234.  
 Blood, Sir Bindon, 52.  
 Bodhisattva, legend of the, 77, 79; images and gods of, 85-6, 89; headress of, 88. *See* Buddha.  
 Bohairic MSS., finds of, 283.  
 Boni, G. B. Baldelli, 393-5.  
 Bonomi, Joseph, 25.  
*Book of Duarte Barbosa, The*, vol. i, edited by M. L. Dames, review of, 401-14.  
 Boro-Budur, stūpa of, 244.  
 Bower, Major-Gen. H., MS. found by him, 116-17.  
 Brahma, figures of, 85.  
 Brahman ascetics, 86; fables, 364-6; bronze, 416.  
 Brahmans, their stature, 494; arts, 508; religion, 509; take part in battle, 509; colony of, in Rajputana, 517 seq.; centre of, 521; trade, 525; alphabets, origin of, 618.  
 British Museum, Stein's pictures at, 57; figures at, 84; Babylonian tablets at, 185, 188, 203-4, 575; Manichæan fragment, 207; Ethiopic glossaries, 209.  
 Brooks, E. W., 207.  
 Browne, Professor E. G., 425.  
 Brunot, his *Textes en Arabe*, 611.  
 Buckley, J. J., 154.  
 Buddha, previous existences of, 77; principal disciples of, 86; types of, 87-8, 243; bronze statue of, 240; his family, 295-6; Indian chronicle dates from, 506.  
 Buddhism, 523.  
 Buddhist art, beginnings of, 61, 241-6, 417, 557, 566-7; Madonna, 84, 241; monuments, 106; Nirvana, 587.  
 Budge, Dr. E. A. Wallis, his *Miscellaneous Coptic Texts in the Dialects of Upper Egypt*, review of, 283-5.  
 Bühler, Dr., 397-8.  
 Burgess, Dr., his edition of Grünwedel's *Buddhist Art in India*, 77.  
 Burials, Jewish, 253-6.  
 Burlingame, E. W., 231-2.  
 Burnet, Professor J., 560.  
 Bushell, Dr., his bowl, 94.
- C
- Candler, Edmund, *The Sepoy*, 599.  
 Cappadocia, ladies' college in, 588-91.  
 Caste, 78-80, 85; variations in, 494, 519, 522.  
 Catalogue of Sanskrit MSS., 47.

- Central Asia, Stein's expeditions in, 52 seq.
- Chaldean Genesis, 28.
- Chandra Sahib, 286-7.
- Chariots of war, 508.
- Charms, study of, 31.
- Chavannes, Edouard, his work, 265-6.
- China, international relations with Russia, 98-102; its position in E. Asia, 269-70; competitive examinations in, 270-1; law, 271.
- Chinese Archaeological Review, 373.
- Chinese Customs, 93-4; emigration, 94; diplomacy of, 95; missionaries, 95, 98; treachery, 101; philosophy, 567; influences in Philippines, 585.
- Christensen, Arthur, his *Contes Persans*, review of, 279-80.
- Clive, Lord, 288.
- Codrington, Dr. O., retirement of, 47.
- Coldstream, J., 263.
- COLDSTREAM, W., Labour Songs in India, 43-6.
- Colloquial English - Persian Dictionary*, by Lieut.-Col. Phillott, review of, 437-49.
- Confucius, teaching of, 269, 273.
- Constantinople, Imperial Ottoman Museum, 3; Faiziyya Mosque at, 620.
- Contenau, Dr. G., 589-91.
- Contes Persans en Langue Populaire*, by Arthur Christensen, review of, 279-80.
- Coomaraswamy, Dr. A. K., his *Dance of Siva*, 414-19.
- Cooper, R. E., 263.
- Coptic manuscripts and papyri, 29, 207; *Miscellaneous Texts in the Dialect of Upper Egypt*, by Dr. E. A. Wallis Budge, review of, 283-5.
- Cordier, Henri, 98, 100, 265-6.
- Cosmogonic tales, 67.
- Countries and Tribes of the Persian Gulf, The*, by Col. S. B. Miles, review of, 601-5.
- COWLEY, A., The Pahlavi Document from Avroman, 147-54.
- CRAWFORD, S. J., The Decipherment of the Hittite Language, 1-13.
- Creation of man, story of, 67; theory of, 68; bilingual account of, 292.
- Creswell, Capt. K. A. C., his *Brief Chronology of Muhammadan Monuments of Egypt*, review of, 611.
- Croce, B., his *Aesthetic*, 415-16.
- Croste, Dr. René, his *Le Svastika*, 107-8.
- CRUM, W. E., A "Manichæan" Fragment from Egypt, 207-8.
- Cultru, M., his *Dupleix, ses plans politiques, sa disgrâce*, 288.
- Cuneiform Texts from Babylonian Tablets*, 199, 205.
- Customs at Shanghai, 93; Canton, 96.
- Czaplicka, Miss M. A., *The Turks of Central Asia*, 266-8.

## D

- D'Abbadie, his *Catalogue raisonné des MSS. Ethiopiens* (1859), 210.
- Dalhousie, Lord, 247, 260.
- Damascus, a Jewish Katib in, 155-84.
- Dames, M. Longworth, his edition of *Book of Duarte Barbosa*, 401-14.
- Dance of Siva, The*, by Dr. A. K. Coomaraswamy, review of, 414-19.
- Daranatz, Canon, his notes on the Svastika, 107.
- Darius Hystaspes, 234, 497, 506, 518.
- Darmesteter, James, 110.
- Davids, Professor Rhys, 124, 128; his *Buddhist India*, 232, 296.
- Davids, Mrs. Rhys, her *Buddhist Psychology*, 232.

Day of Atonement, 257.  
 Daya Ram Sahni, survey of archaeological work, 107.  
 De Goeje Fund, 596.  
 Deir-el-Bahari, temple at, 33.  
 Delitzsch, Dr. Friedrich, 41, 294.  
 Dillmann, his *Lexicon*, 210.  
*Diwān of Ghailān ibn 'Uqbah*,  
 edited by C. H. H. Macartney,  
 review of, 619-23.

Dodwell, H., his edition of *The Private Diary of Ananda Ranga Pillai*, review of, 285-90.

Dozy, his *Spanish Islam*, 610.

Dravidian words, 235; tribes, 500, 502, 518 seq.; trade, 525.

Dublin, National Museum of, 154.

Dupleix, his activities, 285 seq.

Duroiselle, C., on "The Art of Burma and Tantric Buddhism", 105.

## E

École Française de l'Extrême Orient,  
 Bulletin of, 241, 244.

Eggeling, Dr. Julius, obituary notice of, 124-8, 300.

Egyptian Archæology, Journal of, 34.

Egyptian archæology, hieroglyphic writing, 1; civilization of, 2; Exploration Fund, 34, 35.

Elemental Stūpa. *See* Japanese Sotoba.

Elgin, Lord, his destruction of the Summer Palace at Peking, 101-2; his *Letters and Journals*, 102.

*Encyclopædia Britannica*, 234.

Enlil and Ninlil, the Divine Lovers, by Dr. T. G. Pinches, 185-205, 575-80.

*Epigraphia Indica*, 237, 239.

Eraniān dialects, 274, 276.

Eridu, city of Paradise, 292-3.

Esarhaddon, age of, 186.

Etana, legend of, 37.

Ethiopic-Falasi glossary, 209-30.

Etruscan invasion, 12; rulers of Latium, 12.

*Étude sur les Emprunts Syriaques*, par l'Abbé Michel J. Feghali, 611-12.

Etymological notes, 63.

Euphrates, 292-4.

Eurasian, 62-3.

*Expansion of British India*, The, 258-60.

## F

Fall of Man, story of, 69.

Fātimid Caliphs, reign of (969-1171 A.D.), 158.

Feghali, l'Abbé Michel J., his *Études sur les Emprunts Syriaques*, review of, 611-12.

Fergusson, his *History of Indian Archaeology*, 564-5.

Five Elements, the, 557-8.

Fleet, Dr., 236-7, 239, 261.

Flood, story of, 69-70.

Forlong, Major-General, 558.

Foucher, A., his *L'Art Gréco-Bouddhique du Gandhara* (1905), 77-91, 241-2; his *Iconographie Bouddhique* (1900, 1905), 241; his *Beginnings of Buddhist Art and other Essays* (1917), 241-6.

Four Assyriological Notes, by S. Langdon, 37-42.

Frazer, Sir James G., his *Folklore in the Old Testament*, review of, 65-76.

## G

Gandhāra sculptures, 77, 91, 242-3; Brahmins of, 518.

Ganga rulers and records, 236-9.

Ganges, Middle, populations of, 493; characters of, 501-6, 519, 524 seq.

*Garden of Eden*, *From the, to the Crossing of the Jordan*, by Sir W. Willcocks, review of, 290-4.

Garrett, H. L. O., editor of Cunningham's *History of the Sikhs*, 246-7.

Garstang, Professor, discovery of Sun-temple at Meroë, 34.

- Genesis, earthly Paradise, 292; rivers of, 293.
- German Imperial Archæological Institute, 3; Oriental Society, 3.
- Gibb Memorial Fund, 423.
- Gilgamish, national hero of Sumer and Akkad, 37.
- Goeje, Fondation de, 48.
- Goshen, Land of, 291.
- Grantham, A. E., his *Pencil Sketchings from Peking*, review of, 269-74.
- Graves of Europeans at Isfahān, 321-52.
- Greek literature, 1; documents, 147, 153; Græco-Roman pantheon, 200; art, 417; philosophy, 560; of Asia Minor, 588.
- Grierson, Sir George, 61; his *Ormuri or Bargista Languages*, 274-6.
- Grünbaum, David, 277.
- Grünwedel, his *Buddhist Art in India*, 77.
- Guidi, his dictionary, 210.
- Guptas, empire of the, 260-2, 505, 522-3.
- H
- Haas, Dr., 125.
- HART, Lieut.-Col. T. W., Graves of Europeans in the Armenian Cemetery at Isfahān, 321-52.
- Hajiabad inscriptions, 154-5.
- Hakluyt Society, 401-2.
- Hall, H. R., *Ancient History of the Near East*, 2.
- Hammu-rabi, 186.
- Handbook for Travellers in India, etc., notice of, 612-13.
- Hardinge, Lord, of Penshurst, 588.
- Hargreaves, H., report on Kangra District, 105.
- Hārīti, a goddess, 83-4.
- Hart, Sir Robert, 92-6, 97-8.
- Hāthigumphā inscriptions, 396-9.
- Hebrew views about the ocean, 281.
- Hellenic Society, 154.
- Hellenic Studies, Journal of, 147.
- Hemacandra, an Arabic word quoted by, 235.
- Herodotus, 1, 12, 275, 497, 510, 518.
- Heth, children of, 2. *See* Hittites.
- Hiddekel. *See* Tigris.
- Hindu monuments, 106; medicine, 117; theocracy, 508; society, 509, 510; teaching, 520; Neo-Hinduism, 523.
- Hindustani Manual*, 3rd ed., by Lieut.-Col. D. C. Phillott, review of, 435-7.
- HIRSCHFELD, Dr. Hartwig, An Ethiopic-Falasi Glossary, 209-30.
- History of the Sikhs from the Origin of the Nation to the Battles of the Sutlej*, by J. D. Cunningham, review of, 246-9.
- Hittite Empire, 10-12.
- inscriptions, 3, 28.
- kings, 3, 4.
- language, decipherment of, 1-13; identical with Arzawa, 2; an Indo-European tongue, 4, 7.
- people, 2, 31; original seats of, 11.
- Hoernle, Dr. Augustus Frederic Rudolf, 53; obituary notice of, 44, 124; bibliography, 119-24.
- Holma, Dr., 42.
- Hoo Chi-Tsai, his *Les Bases Conventionnelles des Relations Modernes entre la Chine et la Russie*, 98-102.
- HOPKINS, L. C., Pictographic Reconnaissances, part iii, 369-88.
- Houssay, M., his work on the Swastika, 108.
- Howell, Capt. G. C., 263.
- Hrozný, Dr. Friedrich, 1, 2, 4, 6.
- Hutchison, Dr. J., 263.
- I
- Iconography of the religions of the East, 77; Buddhist, 85-6.
- Indian music, 276-7; poetry, 277; women, 277-8; vernacular literatures, 278.
- Indo-Chinese languages, 249.



Indra, figures of, 85, 497.  
 Indus basin, population of, 493,  
 503, 505, 518 seq.; passage of,  
 506.  
 Inscriptions, Cuneiform, 1, 37;  
 Hittite, 3, 28; South Indian,  
 104.  
*IR* = *zu'tu*, meaning of, 42.  
 Iranian race, 496.  
 Isfahān, European graves at,  
 321-52.  
 Islam Akhun, his forgeries, 54.  
 Ismaili MSS. in Petrograd, 429-35.  
 Ivanow, W. A., his Ismaili MSS.  
 in the Asiatic Museum of Petro-  
 grad, 429-35.

## J

Jackson, Sir T. G., 108.  
*Jai Singh, The Astronomical Ob-  
 servatories of*, 427-9.  
 Jainism, 523.  
 Japanese Sotoba, on the, by James  
 Troup, 557-73.  
*Jastrow, Civilisation of Babylonia  
 and Assyria*, 2.  
*Jātakas*, 77, 82, 231-2, 245; reliefs  
 at Bharhut, 242 seq.  
 Java, sculptures in, 243.  
 Jayaswal, Mr., 395-9.  
 Jewish cabalistic literature, 595.  
 Jewish history, place of the Law  
 in, 74; customs, 253-8.  
 Jews and Christians, restrictions  
 against, 158.  
 Jews' College, library of, 209.  
 Job, date of Book of, 234, 586-7.  
 Jordan, crossing of, 290-3.  
*Journal Asiatique*, 241.  
 Jouveau-Dubreuil, G., *The Pallavas*,  
 233.  
 Jovanovič, K. J., 108.

## K

Kanchī, town and country of, 581-2.  
 Kaniška, 82.  
 Karaite hymns, 155.  
 Kashmir, historian of, 51; lore,  
 52; Stein's journeys from, 57-8;

pre-Muhammadan monuments  
 in, 105.  
 Kay, H. C., editor of *'Umārah's  
 History of the Yaman*, 425.  
 Kaye, G. R., his *Astronomical  
 Observatories of Jai Singh*, review  
 of, 427-9.  
 Keith, Dr. A. Berriedale, *The  
 Sāṅkhya System, a History of the  
 Sāṅkhya Philosophy*, 421.  
 KENNEDY, J., Aryan Invasion of  
 Northern India, 493-529.  
 Khāravēla, 395-9.  
 Kharoshthī alphabet, origin of, 618.  
 King, Professor L. W., his *History  
 of Sumer and Akkad*, 606;  
 obituary notice of, 625-6.  
 Kings, clans led by, 509.  
 Koldewey, Professor, his *Excava-  
 tions in Babylon*, 606.  
 Kulu, a Gazetteer of, 262 5.  
 Kunick, Rev. H., 263.  
 Kurdish dialect, 274.  
 Kuru kings, 514.  
 Kuru-Pañchāla country, 521.

## L

Labour songs in India, W. Cold-  
 stream, 43-6.  
 Ladies' College in Cappadocia,  
 588-91.  
 Lall, Panna, his *Dates of Skanda-  
 gupta and his Successors*, 260.  
 Landberg, Count Carlo de, his  
*Langue des Bedouins 'Anazeh*,  
 review of, 609-10.  
 Lang, Andrew, 616.  
 LANGDON, Professor S., *Four  
 Assyriological Notes*, 37-42, 185,  
 205, 296-7.  
*Langue des Bedouins 'Anazeh*,  
 609-10.  
 Laotsze, teachings of, 269, 273.  
 Law, Hebrew, 74-5.  
 Lawrence, Major, 288.  
 Lay, Horatio Nelson, 93.  
 Le Coq, A. von, 207.  
 LEGGÉ, F., *The Society of Biblical  
 Archæology*, 25-36.

- Lobingier, Dr. C. S., his *Ethnology of the Philippines*, 584-6.
- Löwy, Dr. A., 209.
- Lyall, Sir C. J., 620; his *Some Aspects of Ancient Arabic Poetry, as illustrated by a little-known Anthology*, 102-3.
- Lyall, Sir J. B., 263-5.
- M
- Macartney, C. H. H., his edition of *The Divân of Ghailân ibn 'Uqbah*, review of, 619-23.
- Macdonell, Professor A. A., 559.
- Madras Presidency, peoples of, 502.
- Mahābhārata, 559.
- Mahrattas, 497.
- Maithili, a new book in, 235-6.
- Malay origins, 585.
- Malcolm, Sir John, 63, 588.
- Manchu dynasty, 272.
- Manichæan fragment from Egypt, 207-8.
- MANN, Dr. Jacob, Moses and Samuel, a Jewish Katib in Damascus, and his Pilgrimage to Medinah and Mekkah, 155-84.
- Mann, Laws of*, 559.
- Marco Polo, 58. See Note on Chinese Atlas.
- Margoliouth, Professor, 54, 207.
- Mark of Cain, 69.
- Marriage in the East, 418-19.
- Marshall, Sir John, 61, 62; his *Guide to Sāñchi*, 90, 242; his Reports, 104-6.
- Maspero, Henri, 294; his *Struggle of the Nations*, 2.
- Masrur, Śaiva temple at, 105.
- Medes, their settlements, 495, 500.
- Medinah and Mekkah, a pilgrimage to, 155-7.
- Mediterranean types, 498-501.
- Megalithic Culture of Indonesia, The*, by W. J. Perry, review of, 614-17.
- Meithei language, 250, 253.
- Mélanges Sylvain Lévi*, 241.
- Merodach, Babylonian deity, 199, 203, 292.
- Meroë, sun-temple at, 34.
- Mesopotamia, trade of, 601; a small handbook to the history and antiquities of, 605-7; British forces in, 606.
- Milan, Ambrosian Library of, 620.
- Miles, Colonel S. B., 268; *The Countries and Tribes of the Persian Gulf*, 601-3.
- MILLS, Professor, Yasna XLVII of the Gatha Spentamainyu rendered in its Sanskrit Equivalents, 16-23; obituary notice of, 109-13; his publications, 112-13.
- Min-nan-thu temples, frescoes at, 105.
- Minns, Mr., 147.
- Minoans, 12-13.
- Mishnāh, 255.
- Modern Language Research Association, 48.
- Mohammed, burial of, 256.
- Mongolian tribes, 100, 266-8.
- Moreno, Dr. H. W. B., 588.
- Morgan, Mr. Pierpont, 283.
- Morse, Dr. H. B., his *International Relations of the Chinese Empire*, 91-8; his *Trade and Administration of the Chinese Empire*, 91.
- Moule, Rev. A. C., Note on a Chinese Atlas, 393-5.
- Moulton, Professor James Hope, 1; his *Early Zoroastrianism*, 109.
- Mufaḍḍaliyāt, the, 102, 103.
- Muhammadan monuments, a brief chronology of, 611.
- Müller, Professor Max, 109, 125.
- Mundy, Peter, 403-4.
- Murray's Handbook of India, new edition, notice of, 612-13.
- Musée Guimet, publications of, 241.
- Musical instruments at burials, 255.
- Mysore Archæological Department, Annual Report of, 423.

## N

- Nāgas, the, 80.  
 Nālanda, excavations at, 105, 239-40.  
 Narasimhachar, Rao Bahadur R., his Mysore Archaeological Report, 423.  
 Nash, Walter, 32-3, 35.  
 Naville, Professor Ed., 29, 31; discovery of the Eleventh Dynasty temple at Deir-el-Bahari, 33; of Pool of Osiris at Abydos, 34.  
 Niffur or Nippur, tablet of, 38; city of, 185; Sumerian inscriptions from, 185, 199, 202-3.  
 Nin-azu, Babylonian war-god, 200, 202.  
 Nippur. *See* Niffur.  
 Nitrian hermits, 208; monasteries, 283.  
 Note on the Chinese Atlas in the Magliabecchian Library, with reference to Kinsay in Marco Polo, by A. C. M., 393-5.

## O

- Ocean, The, in the Literature of the Western Semites*, review of, by A. T. Wensinck, 281-2.  
 Ojha, Rai Bahadur Pandit Gaurishankar, H., his *Paleography of India*, review of, 617-19.  
 Old Testament, records of, 1, 2, 254; folklore of, 65-76.  
 Oldfield, H. A., 566.  
 Oman, province of, 602-4.  
 Orientalists, Congresses of, Paris, 26; Vienna, 116, 127; Athens, 128.  
 Ōrmurī or Bargistā Languages, an Account of a little-known Eranian Dialect, by Sir G. A. Grierson, review of, 274-5.  
*Oxford History of India, The*, by Dr. V. A. Smith, review of, 420-1.  
 Oxyrhynchus fragments, 207.

## P

- Pahlavi Gathas, 66; document from Avroman; 147-54.  
*Paleography of India*, by Rai Bahadur Pandit G. H. Ojha, 2nd ed., notice of, 617-19.  
 Pali texts and commentaries, sources of, 66, 231-2.  
 Pallava dynasty, 104; copper-plate grants, 104.  
 Panjab Historical Society, 61; District Gazetteers, 262.  
 Panjab, peoples of, 493, 495, 511, 518 seq.; annexation of, by Darius Hystaspes, 497, 506; character of, 503-6; settlements in, 507; aborigines of, 509.  
 PARGITER, F. E., Sagara and the Haihayas, Vasiṣṭha and Aurva, 353-67.  
 Parkes, Sir Harry, 96.  
 Pathak, Professor, 261.  
*Pearl-Strings, The; a History of the Resiliyy Dynasty of Yemen*, by 'Alfyyu'bnu-'l-Hasan 'el-Khazrejiyy, vol. v, review of, 423-7.  
 Peking, Legation siege, 93; treaty of, 98-100; advance of Allies on, 101; destruction of the Summer Palace, 101-2.  
*Pencil Speakings from Peking*, by A. E. Grantham, review of, 269-74.  
 Penukonda, copper-plates from, 236.  
 Peri, M. Noël, his *Les Femmes de Çakya-Muni*, 294.  
 Perry, W. J., *The Megalithic Culture of Indonesia*, review of, 614-17.  
 Persia, dialects of, 274; jest-books or *contes* of, 279; popular language of, 279-80; Jews from Bochara, 280.  
 Persian Gulf, 292, 496; tribes of, 601-3.  
 Persians, their ancestors and settlements, 495; types, 498-500.

- Pettigrew, Rev. W., his *Tangkhul Naga Grammar and Dictionary*, 249-53.
- Philadelphia, Babylonian tablets at, 185.
- Philadelphia Museum, tablets in, 589.
- Philæ, See of, 284-5.
- Philippines, ethnology of, 584-6.
- Phillott, Lieut.-Col. D. C., his *Hindustani Manual*, review of, 435-7; his *Colloquial English-Persian Dictionary*, review of, 437-49.
- Philostratus, 500.
- Pictographic Reconnaissances, pt. iii, by L. C. Hopkins, 369-88.
- PINCES, Dr. Theophilus G., *The Legend of the Divine Lovers: Enlil and Ninlil*, 185-205, 575-80.
- Plato, 561-3; Neo-Platonists, 595.
- Plotinus, 595.
- Pondicherry, 288.
- Portuguese incursions on Persian Gulf, 603.
- Private Diary of Ananda Ranga Pillai*, vol. vi, edited by H. Dodwell, review of, 285.
- Psychology of Music*, by H. P. Krishna Rao, 276-7.
- Pupin, Dr. Michael J., his *South Slav Monuments*, 108.
- Puranic literature, 494; age, 505, 517-18, 521, 583.
- "Pyramids," word in Book of Job, 586-7.
- Pythagoreans, 560-3.
- Q
- Qur'ân, 66, 256, 449.
- R
- Rajputana, colonization of, 502, 515 seq.; museum of, at Ajmer, 617.
- Rao, H. P. Krishna, *The Psychology of Music*, review of, 276-7.
- Rawlinson, Sir Henry, 25, 35, 234; his *Cuneiform Inscriptions of W. Asia*, 36.
- Rawley, Ratan C., *The Silk Industry and Trade*, review of, 600-1; his *Economics of the Silk Trade*, 600.
- Redhouse, Sir James, his edition of al-Khazraj's *History of the Rasûlî Dynasty in the Yaman*, 424.
- Renouf, Sir Peter, 27, 29, 30; English version of the *Book of the Dead*, 31.
- Revue Archéologique*, 241.
- Revue d'Assyriologie*, vol. xiv, 296-7.
- Robertson Smith, Professor, 257.
- Roman literature, 1.
- Rost, Dr., 125.
- Rylands, W. H., 28, 29, 31.
- S
- Sachau, Dr., his publications, 152-3.
- Sagara and the Hailayas, Vasiṣṭha and Aurva, 353-67.
- Sa'idic MSS., 283.
- Sāṁkhya System, The*, by A. Berriedale Keith, review of, 421-2.
- Samudragupta, inscription of, 238.
- Sāṁchī, Guide to*, by Sir John Marshall, 90, 242.
- Sāṁchī, sculptures of, 242.
- Sanskrit, 497-8; MSS., catalogue of, 47, 125, 300; grammarians, 126.
- Sastri, Professor Ganapati, 233.
- Sastri, Rao Sahib H. Krishna, 104, 237.
- Sati, abolition of, 419.
- Satiyaputra of the Asoka Edicts, 581-4.
- Sayce, Professor A. H., *Origin of Semitic Civilization*, 26; study of Cuneiform, 27, 31; preface to Sir W. Willcocks' *Garden of Eden*, 290-1.
- Scarabs, 33.
- Scharff, Dr., 154.

- Scheil, Professor, 38, 42, 297.  
 Schrader, Dr. Otto, obituary notice of, 306.  
 Schwally's *Leben nach dem Tode*, 256.  
 Scythic tribes, 495, 500, 504, 517.  
 Seistan, Stein's journey in, 59, 60.  
 Semitic beliefs, 281-2; customs, 253-8.  
 Senart, Émile, 88.  
 Shanghai, Customs arrangements at, 93.  
 Shih, the Emperor, 270.  
 Siddhārtha, 86, 88. *See* Buddha.  
 Sikhs, history of, 246-9.  
 Silk industry and trade, 600-1.  
 Sin, the moon-god. *See* Zuenna.  
 Siva, *The Dance of*, 414-19.  
 Skandagupta and his successors, dates of, 260.  
 Smith, Professor Elliot, 264.  
 Smith, George, Early History of Babylonia, 26; excavations in Nineveh, 27.  
 SMITH, Dr. V. A., 395-9; account of Sir M. Aurel Stein's work, 49-61; his *Oxford History of India, from the earliest times to the end of 1911*, review of, 420-1; his *Early History of India*, 420.  
 Smyly, Dr., 154.  
 Snouck-Hurgronje, C., 48.  
*Some Semitic Rites of Mourning and Religion*, by A. J. Wensinck, 253-8.  
 Sotoba. *See* Japanese Sotoba.  
 South Indian history, beginnings of, 596-9.  
 Spooner, Dr., report of excavations at Nālanda, 105, 289-40; archaeological reports, 106.  
 Śrāvasti, miracle at, 242.  
 Stein, Sir M. Aurel, the work of, 49-61; his *Mountain Panoramas from the Pāmirs and Kwen Lun*, 51; his translation of the *Rājataranginī* of Kalhana, 51-2; his *Archæological Survey Progress Report* for 1904-5, 52; expeditions in Central Asia, 52-61; his *Preliminary Report of a Journey in Chinese Turkestan* (1901), 53; his *Sand-buried Ruins of Khotan, a personal narrative*, 54; his *Ruins of Desert Cathay* (1912), 55; his *Serindia*, 60; his collections, 57-60; his journeys, 57-61.  
 Stephen, Miss D. J., her *Studies in Early Indian Thought*, review of, 421-2.  
 Stokes, P. Griffin, his translation of Dozy's *Spanish Islam*, 610.  
*Studies in Early Indian Thoughts*, by Dorothea Jane Stephen, review of, 421-2.  
 Sumerian-Accadian ideograms and inscriptions, 4, 185; Babylonian beliefs in myths, 37, 282; tablet at Nippur, 38; dialect of, 186.  
 Sumēru, Mount, 557.  
 Svastika, Le, 107-8.  
 Syriac language, 207-8.
- T
- Tabernacles, Feast of, 255.  
 Tagtūg, identification of the name, 37-41.  
 Tangkhul Naga Grammar and Dictionary, 249.  
 Tao, the divine way, 269.  
 Taxila, excavations at, 105.  
 Tell-el-Amarna tablets, 3, 4, 29.  
 Textes Arabes, 609-12.  
 Thomas, Dr. F. W., 78, 241, 246.  
 Thomas, Miss L. A., 78, 241, 246.  
 Thompson, J. E., 62.  
 Thompson, Captain R. Campbell, 34, 39; his *Small Handbook to the History and Antiquities of Mesopotamia*, review of, 605-7.  
 Thorbecke, his publication of parts of the Mufaḍḍaliyāt, 103.  
 Threshing-floor, 253.  
 Thureau-Dangin, W., 589.  
 Tientsin, massacre at, 95; treaty of, 98, 100.

Tigris and Euphrates (*Hiddekel* and *Pervath*), 291-3.

*Traek af Indiens Kultur*, by A. Yusuf Ali, review of, 277-9.

Trees, of life and death, 68.

Tribes, movements of, in ancient India, 355-62.

Trivandrum Sanskrit Series, 233.

Troup, James, on the Japanese Sotoba or Elemental Stūpa, 557-73.

Turkestan, Russian, 50 ; Chinese, 53, 60, 117-18 ; paintings, 59 ; script, 207 ; human remains in, 498 ; migrations of, 506 ; population of, 511.

*Turks of Central Asia, The*, by M. A. Czaplicka, review of, 266-8.

Tylor, Sir Edward, 70.

## V

Vajrapāni, 81-2.

Vasiṣṭha, the first and second, 353.

Vedic hymns, 66 ; literature, 494, 506, 508, 510-14, 520, 528 ; rites, 523.

Venkayya, Rai Bahadur V., 104.

Vienna, Oriental Congress of, 116.

Vijayanagar Empire, 410.

Vogel, Dr. J., 62.

## W

Waddell, Lieut.-Col. L. A., his *Buddhism of Tibet*, 263.

Wahabis, tribe of, 604.

Watching the dead, 256.

Wealth, genius of, 83.

Wensinck, Dr. A. J., his *Bar Hebraeus' Book of the Dove*, 48 ; his *Some Semitic Rites of Mourning*

and *Religion*, 253-8 ; *The Ocean in the Literature of the Western Semites*, 281-2 ; his translation of *Bar Hebraeus's Book of the Dove*, 593-6.

Westergaard, his *Bundehesh*, 154.

Whitehead, *Catalogue of the Coins in the Lahore Museum*, quoted, 84.

Wickremasinghe, M. de Z., 235.

Wilkins, Sir Charles, 125.

Willcocks, Sir William, his *From the Garden of Eden to the Crossing of the Jordan*, review of, 290-4.

Williams, Wells, *The Middle Kingdom*, 102.

Wilson, Professor H. H., 77, 125.

Winckler, Hugo, 2, 3.

Windisch, Dr. Ernst, 125-6 ; obituary notices of, 299-306.

Winternitz, Professor, 47 ; his *Indische Literaturgeschichte*, 232.

Woolner, Mr., 62.

## Y

Yakṣas, 80-1.

Yao, the Emperor, 270.

Yasna XLVII. See Mills, Professor.

*Yemen, a History of the Resūliyy Dynasty of*, by al-Khazraji, 423-7 ; *History of the Yaman* by 'Umārah, 425.

Yule, Sir H., his *Marco Polo*, 393.


## Z

Zarubin, I., Ismaili MSS. at Petrograd, 429 seq.

Zeuss, his *Grammatica Celtica*, 306.

Zimmer, Professor H., 304.

Zuenna, the moon-god Sin, 200, 202.



For facility of reference this Appendix will be published with  
the April and October Numbers of the Journal.

TRANSLITERATION  
OF THE  
SANSKRIT, ARABIC,  
AND ALLIED ALPHABETS

THE system of Transliteration shown in the Tables given overleaf is almost identical with that approved of by the International ORIENTAL CONGRESS of 1894; and, in a Resolution, dated October, 1896, the Council of the ROYAL ASIATIC SOCIETY earnestly recommended its adoption (so far as possible) by all in this country engaged in Oriental studies, "that the very great benefit of a uniform system" may be gradually obtained.



## SANSKRIT AND ALLIED ALPHABETS

अ . . . . . a	ओ . . . . . o	ट . . . . . ṭ	ब . . . . . b
आ . . . . . ā	औ . . . . . au	ठ . . . . . ṭh	भ . . . . . bh
इ . . . . . i	क . . . . . k	ड . . . . . ḍ	म . . . . . m
ई . . . . . ī	ख . . . . . kh	ढ . . . . . ḍh	य . . . . . y
उ . . . . . u	ग . . . . . g	ण . . . . . ṇ	र . . . . . r
ऊ . . . . . ū	घ . . . . . gh	त . . . . . t	ल . . . . . l
ऋ . . . . . ṛ	ङ . . . . . ṅ	थ . . . . . th	व . . . . . v
ॠ . . . . . ṝ	च . . . . . c	द . . . . . d	श . . . . . ś
ऌ . . . . . ḷ	छ . . . . . ch	ध . . . . . dh	ष . . . . . ṣ
ॡ . . . . . ḹ	ज . . . . . j	न . . . . . n	स . . . . . s
ए . . . . . e	झ . . . . . jh	प . . . . . p	ह . . . . . h
ऐ . . . . . ai	ञ . . . . . ñ	फ . . . . . ph	ळ . . . . . ḷ

◌̣ (Anusvāra) . . . . . ṁ	◌̇ (Avagraha) . . . . . ’
◌̣̣ (Amunāsika) . . . . . ṃ̇	Udātta . . . . . ◌̣̣̣
◌̣̣̣ (Visārga) . . . . . ḥ	Svarita . . . . . ◌̣̣̣̣
× (Jihvāmūliya) . . . . . ḥ	Anudātta . . . . . ◌̣̣̣̣̣
◌̣̣̣̣ (Upadhmānīya) . . . . . ḥ	

## II

### ARABIC AND ALLIED ALPHABETS

ا at beginning of word omit;	ك . . . . . k	ا . . . . . a
elsewhere . . . . . <u>ـ</u> or <u>و</u>	ل . . . . . l	ي . . . . . i
ب . . . . . b	س . . . . . s	م . . . . . m
ت . . . . . t	ش . s or <u>sh</u>	و . . . . . ū
ث . t or <u>th</u>	ص . . s or z	و . . w or v
ج . j or <u>dj</u>	ض d, <u>dz</u> , or z	ه . . . . . h
ح . . . . . h	ط . . . . . t	ي . . . . . y
خ . h or <u>kh</u>	ظ . . . . . z	و . . . . . au
د . . . . . d	ع . . . . . ʿ	wasla . . . . . ʾ
ذ . d or <u>dh</u>	غ . g or <u>gh</u>	VOWELS.
ر . . . . . r	ف . . . . . f	ـ . . . . . a
ز . . . . . z	ق . . . . . q	ـ . . . . . i
		ـ . . . . . u
		DIPHTHONGS.
		اَ . . . . . ai
		اَو . . . . . au
		hamza ـ or و
		silent t . . . . . h
		letter not pro-
		nounced . . . . . ʾ

### ADDITIONAL LETTERS

PERSIAN, HINDI, AND PAKSHTŪ.	TURKISH ONLY.	HINDI AND PAKSHTŪ.	PAKSHTŪ ONLY.
پ . . . . . p	ک when pro-	ت or پ . . . . . t	خ . . . . . ts
چ . c or <u>ch</u>	nounced as	د or پ . . . . . d	پ . . . . . g
ز . z or <u>zh</u>	g . . . . . k	ز or د . . . . . r	پ . . . . . n
گ . . . . . g	گ . . . . . ñ		ش . . . . . ksh



# RULES RELATING TO MEMBERSHIP AND SUBSCRIPTIONS

4. Any person desirous of becoming an Ordinary Member must be nominated by one Member and seconded by another, of whom one must act on a personal knowledge that the candidate is likely to be a suitable and useful Member; and the nominating Member shall address the Secretary in writing and give the candidate's name, address, and occupation or status, and shall state to which of the aforesaid classes the candidate desires to be admitted.

17. The annual subscriptions of Ordinary Members shall be as follows:—

	£	s.	d.
Resident Members . . . .	3	3	0
Non-resident Members . . . .	1	10	0

19. Ordinary Members may compound for their subscriptions at the following rates:—

In lieu of all future annual sub- scriptions, both as Resident and as Non-resident Members . . . .	45	guineas.
In lieu of all future annual sub- scriptions as Non-resident . . . .	22½	„

23. The first payment of subscription is due on election but if a Member be elected in November or December of any year, the first annual subscription paid by him shall cover the year beginning on the 1st January next after his election.

24. Annual subscriptions shall be due on the first day of January of each year.

---

Every member of the Society whose subscription is paid is entitled to receive the quarterly Journal post free.

[P.T.O.]

Those desirous of joining the Society are requested to fill in this form and to forward it to the address of "The Secretary, Royal Asiatic Society, 22 Albemarle Street, London, W."

---

# ROYAL ASIATIC SOCIETY

---

## CERTIFICATE OF RECOMMENDATION

*being desirous of becoming a Member of the ROYAL ASIATIC SOCIETY, we, whose names are hereunto subscribed, do hereby recommend to the Society as a Candidate.*

*Proposer* .....

*Seconder* .....





LIST OF THE MEMBERS  
OF THE  
ROYAL ASIATIC SOCIETY  
OF  
GREAT BRITAIN AND IRELAND

*FOUNDED MARCH, 1823*

---

CORRECTED TO MAY 13, 1919

---

22 ALBEMARLE STREET  
LONDON, W.



# ROYAL ASIATIC SOCIETY

---

## PATRON

HIS MOST EXCELLENT MAJESTY THE KING.

## VICE-PATRON

THE SECRETARY OF STATE FOR INDIA.

## HONORARY VICE-PRESIDENTS

- 1919 OLIVER CODRINGTON, M.D., F.S.A.  
1919 REV. A. H. SAYCE, D.LITT., LL.D., D.D.

## COUNCIL OF MANAGEMENT FOR 1919-20

### PRESIDENT

- 1914 THE RIGHT HON. THE LORD REAY, K.T., P.C., G.C.S.I., LL.D.

### DIRECTOR

- 1914 THE RIGHT HON. SIR H. MORTIMER DURAND, P.C.,  
G.C.M.G., K.C.S.I.

## VICE-PRESIDENTS

- 1915 M. LONGWORTH DAMES, Esq., I.C.S. ret.  
1915 SIR CHARLES J. LYALL, K.C.S.I., D.LITT., LL.D., Ph.D.  
1916 F. E. PARGIER, Esq., M.A., I.C.S. ret.  
1915 VINCENT A. SMITH, Esq., C.I.E., M.A., I.C.S. ret.

## HONORARY OFFICERS

- 1917 A. G. ELLIS, Esq., M.A. (*Hon. Librarian*).  
1917 J. KENNEDY, Esq., I.C.S. ret. (*Hon. Treasurer*).  
1917 SIR GEORGE A. GRIERSON, K.C.I.E., Ph.D., F.B.A. } (*Hon. Joint*  
1918 M. LONGWORTH DAMES, Esq. } *Secretaries*).

## ORDINARY MEMBERS OF COUNCIL

- 1917 J. D. ANDERSON, Esq., M.A., LITT.D., I.C.S. ret.  
1917 PROFESSOR L. D. BARNETT, Litt.D.  
1918 R. GRANT BROWN, Esq., I.C.S. ret.  
1916 M. GASTER, Ph.D.  
1919 SIR HENRY H. HOWORTH, K.C.I.E., D.C.L., F.R.S.  
1917 L. C. HOPKINS, Esq., I.S.O.  
1918 F. LEGGE, Esq., F.S.A.  
1916 PROFESSOR A. A. MACDONELL, M.A., Ph.D.  
1915 PROFESSOR MARGOLIOUTH, M.A., F.B.A., D.Litt.  
1916 SIR JOHN MARSHALL, C.I.E.  
1919 H. BALLOU MORSE, Esq., LL.D.  
1919 E. S. M. PEROWNE, Esq.  
1917 LIEUT.-COLONEL D. C. PHILLOTT.  
1919 W. H. RYLANDS, Esq., F.S.A.  
1916 MAJOR W. PERCEVAL YETTS

---

## SECRETARY AND LIBRARIAN

- 1918 MISS ELEANOR HULL.

## ASS. SECRETARY

- 1917 MISS PHILLIPS.

## ASS. LIBRARIAN

- 1919 MISS LATIMER.

## HONORARY SOLICITOR

ALEXANDER HAYMAN WILSON, Esq.,  
Westminster Chambers, 5 Victoria Street, S.W.

# COMMITTEES

---

## FINANCE

DR. M. GASTER.	SIR C. J. LYALL.
MR. L. C. HOPKINS.	MR. E. S. M. PEROWNE.
MR. J. KENNEDY.	DR. F. W. THOMAS.

## LIBRARY

MR. WILLIAM FOSTER.	SIR C. J. LYALL.
DR. M. GASTER.	DR. H. B. MORSE.
MR. J. KENNEDY.	MR. R. SEWELL.
MR. F. LEGGE.	DR. F. W. THOMAS.

## PUBLICATIONS COMMITTEE

DR. L. BARNETT.	PROF. A. A. MACDONELL
DR. M. GASTER.	PROF. MARGOLIOUTH.
MR. L. C. HOPKINS.	MR. W. H. RYLANDS.
SIR C. J. LYALL.	DR. VINCENT SMITH.
DR. F. W. THOMAS.	

## ENTENTE

MR. C. OTTO BLAGDEN.	DR. H. B. MORSE.
MR. M. LONGWORTH DAMES.	MR. F. E. PARGITER.
SIR GEORGE GRIERSON.	PROF. E. J. RAPSON.
SIR CHARLES J. LYALL.	DR. F. W. THOMAS (Secretary).

## MEDAL

SIR MORTIMER DURAND.	SIR C. J. LYALL.
DR. M. GASTER.	DR. VINCENT SMITH.
SIR ARTHUR WOLLASTON.	

## HONORARY AUDITORS, 1919-20

MRS. FRAZER (for the Society).  
MR. L. C. HOPKINS (for the Council).

*\*\* The President of the Society and the Honorary Officers of the Society are ex-officio members of all Committees.*

# Members

## RESIDENT AND NON-RESIDENT

N.B.—The marks prefixed to the names signify—

\* Non-resident Members.

† Members who have compounded for their subscriptions.

‡ Library Members.

§ Members who have served on the Council.

- 1902 HIS MOST EXCELLENT MAJESTY THE KING, K.G.  
 1882 FIELD-MARSHAL HIS ROYAL HIGHNESS THE DUKE OF  
 CONNAUGHT, K.G.  
 1917 \*ABUL FAZL, Ph.D., LL.D., *Kapurthala, India.*  
 1916 \*ACHARYA, Chintamani, B.A., *Zemindar of Purunahat*  
*Sasan, P. O. Kishorenagar, Cuttack, Orissa, India.*  
 1919 ADAM, Miss F. S., *25 Holland St., W. 8.*  
 1917 \*ADIKARI, M. S., *Dandia Bazaar, Baroda, Bombay*  
*Presidency.*  
 1919 ADIL, Moulvi Mohd. Aktar, M.A., Head Master,  
*Government High School, Unao, U.P., India.*  
 1912 \*AFZAL, Nawabzada Bahadur Khwaja Muhammad,  
*The Palace, 1 Armenian St., Dacca, E.B. & A.,*  
*India.*  
 1900 \*AHMAD, Aziz-uddin, Khan Bahadur, *Judicial Minister,*  
*Dholpur, Rajputana, India.*  
 10 1918 \*AHMAD, Fakhruddin, M.A., *Hastings House, Alipur,*  
*Calcutta.*  
 1909 \*AHMAD, Maulavi Kamaluddin, Shams ul-Ulama, M.A.,  
*Provincial Educational Service, E. B. & A.;*  
*Superintendent, Government Madrasah, Chittagong,*  
*Eastern Bengal.*  
 1910 \*AHMAD, Maulavi Saiyid Makbul, *Fatehgarh, U.P.,*  
*India.*  
 1912 \*AINSCOUGH, T. M., *Office of H.M. Trade Commissioner,*  
*McLeod House, 28 Dalhousie St., Calcutta.*  
 1902 AINSLIE, Douglas, *Athenæum Club, Pall Mall, S.W.1.*  
 1903 \*AIYANGAR, Professor S. Krishnaswami, *University of*  
*Madras, Srivasam Nadu St., Mylapore, Madras.*  
 1906 \*AIYAR, K. G. Sessa, *High Court Vakil, Trivandrum,*  
*Travancore, South India.*

- 1915 \*AIYAR, V. Natesa, B.A., *Superintendent Archaeological Survey, Frontier Circle, Peshawar, N.W.F.P., India.*
- 1916 \*AIYENGAR, A. R. Duraswami, *Lakshmi Vilas, Sunkuvar Agraharam St., Chintadripet, Madras.*
- 1912 \*AIYER, Kandadai Vaidinatha Subramanya, *Publication Assistant to the Epigraphist of Madras, 40 Poona-mallee High Road, Terepy, Madras.*
- 20 1917 \*AIYER, M. S. Ramaswami, B.A., *Deputy Superintendent of Police, Ellore, Krishna Dist., S. India.*
- 1917 \*AIYER, Padmanabha R., B.A., *Taikad, Trivandrum, Travancore, S. India.*
- 1874 \*†AKAMATZU RENJO, Rev., *Nishi Hongwanji, Kyoto, Japan.*
- 1916 \*AKHTAR, Muhammad Abdul Qadir, Sahib, *Deputy Superintendent of Police, Dindigul, Madurai, Madras.*
- 1907 \*ALI, Muhammad Azhare, "*Payam-i-Umid*" Office, *Agra, U.P., India.*
- 1908 \*ALI, S. Raza, *Assistant Opium Agent, Sidhauri, Sitapur, U.P., India.*
- 1909 \*ALI, Saiyid Aijaz, *Deputy Collector, P.O. Nadbai, Bharatpur State, Rajputana, India.*
- 1917 \*ALI, Syed Zahur, B.A., *Head Master, Warangal High School, Hanamkondah, Nizam's Dominions, India.*
- 1909 ALLAN, J., M.A., *British Museum, W.C. 1.*
- 1904 \*ALVAREZ, Justin C. W., *I.S.O., H.B.M. Consul, Tripoli, Barbary, Union Club, Malta.*
- 30 1904 §AMEER ALI, The Right Hon. Syed, P.C., C.I.E., LL.D., *2 Cadogan Place, S.W. 1.*
- 1919 AMHERST OF HACKNEY, Baroness, *Stowlangtoft Hall, Bury St. Edmunds.*
- 1907 §\*ANDERSON, J. D., M.A., Litt.D., I.C.S. (ret.), *Mostyn House, Brooklands Avenue, Cambridge.*
- 1919 \*ANSARY, Khwaja Amir Ahmad, B.A., *Mohallu Ansar, Panipat, India; Islamia High School, Lucknow, U.P., India.*
- 1915 \*ANTANI, Pandit Rati Lal M., B.A., *Appellate Judge, Jhalawar State, Jhalrapatan, Rajputana, India.*
- 1917 \*ARGYLL-SAXBY, C. F., M.A., *The High School, Perth, Western Australia.*

- 1918 \*ARYALANKAR, Saddharmavagis Rev. Sri, *Bhikshu, Joint Secretary, Bengal Buddhist Association, 1 Buddhist Temple Lane, Calcutta.*
- 1917 \*AYENGAR, Professor S. V. Rangasamy, *Vainecka Vidwan, Vepery, Madras.*
- 1909 \*AYYANGAR, T. R. Sriniyasa, 308 *Aiyavaiyar Lane, West Main St., Tanjore, South India.*
- 1914 \*AZIM, M.A., *Christ's College, Cambridge.*
- 
- 40 1918 BA, Saya Maung, *Head Master, A.B. High School, Ahlone, Rangoon, Burma.*
- 1917 \*BADDELEY, J. F., 34 *Bruton St., London, W. 1.*
- 1903 \*BAILEY, Rev. T. Grahame, M.A., B.D., *Wazirabad, Panjab, India.*
- 1918 \*BAKER, Lieut. Charles C., *Pierce Navigation Co., Texas City, Texas, U.S.A.*
- 1910 \*BANERJEA, Dr. Rasbihari, M.B., F.I.A.Sc., *Santi Cootir, Bally, Bengal.*
- 1918 \*BANERJEA, Jyoti Prasad, B.A., B.L., *Munsif Provincial Civil Service, Judicial Br., Bengal, Kandi P.O., Dt. Murshidabad, Bengal.*
- 1917 \*BANERJEE, Babu Kedareshwar, B.A., *Assistant Engineer, C.P., P.O., Nabadwip, Bengal.*
- 1910 \*BANERJI, Babu Rakhal Das, *Superintendent Archaeological Survey, Western Circle, Poona, Bombay Presidency.*
- 1918 \*BARAKET-ULLAH, M.A., *Professor of Philosophy, Forman Christian College, Lahore, India.*
- 1912 \*BARNARD, J. T. O., C.I.E., *Asst. Commissioner, Myit Kyina, Burma.*
- 50 1904 §BARNETT, Lionel D., Litt.D., *Professor of Sanskrit, University College; British Museum, W. C. 1, and 15 Avenue Crescent, W. 3.*
- 1890 \*†BARODA, His Highness Mahārāja Sayaji Rao Bahadur, G.C.S.I., Gaekwar of.
- HON. 1906 BASSET, René, *Professor of Arabic, Villa Louise, Rue Denfort, Rochereau, Algiers.*
- 1881 \*†BATE, Rev. J. Drew, 15 *St. John's Church Rd., Folkestone.*

- 1909 \*BAVANANDAM PILLAI, Rao Bahadur S., *Asst. Commissioner of Police, Madras City, Newton House, Church Rd., Vepery, Madras.*
- 1919 BAXTER, Wynne E., 170 *Church St., Stoke Newington, N. 16.*
- 1907 \*BEAZLEY, Professor C. Raymond, D.Litt., *The University, Edmund St., Birmingham.*
- 1917 \*BEDI, Bawa Hari Duss, *Barrister-at-Law, Jullundar City, Panjab, India.*
- 1901 BELL, Miss Gertrude, 95 *Sloane St., S.W. 1; Rounton Grange, Northallerton, Yorks.*
- 1913 \*†BELVALKAR, Shripad Krishna, M.A., Ph.D., *Asst. Professor, Deccan College, 339 Narayan Peth, Poona, India.*
- 60 1913 \*BERNARD, Pierre Arnold, *Shastri, 145 Christie St., Leonia, N.J.; G.P.O. Box 45, 662 West End Avenue, New York City, U.S.A.*
- 1916 \*BERRY, Lala Sardharam, *Supervisor P.W.D., Distillery Road, Narayanpada, Hyderabad, Deccan, India.*
- 1892 \*BEVAN, A. A., M.A., *Lord Almoner's Reader in Arabic, Trinity College, Cambridge.*
- 1893 §BEVERIDGE, H., *Pitfold, Shottermill, Surrey.*
- 1899 †BEVERIDGE, Mrs. H., *Pitfold, Shottermill, Surrey.*
- 1904 \*BEVIR, Edward Laurence, 2 *Rue Mésangère, Avenue des Balives, Valence-sur-Rhône, France.*
- 1882 \*†BHABHA, Rev. Shapurje D., M.D., 8 *Drakefell Rd., St. Catherine's Park, S.E. 14.*
- 1917 \*BHANDARI, K. C., B.A., *Barrister-at-Law, Ferozpour City, Panjab, India.*
- HON. 1885 BHANDARKAR, Sir Ramkrishna Gopal, K.C.I.E. LL.D., *Sangamaśrama, Poona, Bombay.*
- 1917 \*BHATIA, A. Singh, *Barrister-at-Law, Kotli, Gujranwala, Panjab, India.*
- 70 1918 \*BHAT, V. G., B.A., *Fitzwilliam Hall, Cambridge.*
- 1909 \*BHATTACHARYA, Babu Bisiswar, *Deputy Magistrate, Krishnagar, Bengal.*
- 1912 \*BHATTACHARYA, Babu Jyotischandra, M.A., *Vakil High Court, Purnea, Behar, India.*
- 1911 \*BISHAGRATNA, Kaviraj K. L., 10 *Kashi Ghosh's Lane, Beadon Square, Calcutta.*
- 1911 \*BLACKMAN, A. M., Litt.D., 24 *Bardwell Rd., Oxford.*

- 1895 §BLAGDEN, C. Otto, 57. *Earl's Court Square, S.W. 5.*
- 1919 BLANCHARD, R. H., *Sharia Kamel, Cairo, Egypt.*
- 1897 \*§BLUMHARDT, Professor James Fuller, *Woodlands, Gerrard's Cross, Bucks.*
- 1909 \*BLUNT, E. A. H., I.C.S., *c/o Secretariat, Allahabad, U.P., India.*
- 1902 \*†BOBBILI, Maharaja Dhiraja Sri Rao Sir Venketasvetasvetachalapati Ranga Rao Bahadur, G.C.I.E., *Zamindar of, Vizagapatam, South India.*
- 80 1895 BODE, Mrs. M. Haynes, Ph.D., *c/o Ralph Thicknesse, Esq., 5 Little College St., S.W. 1.*
- 1918 \*BOUNTRA, Abnashi Ram, *Government High School, Church St., Jullundur City, Panjab, India.*
- 1911 \*BOYER, M. l'Abbé A. M., 114 *Rue du Bac, Paris, VII<sup>e</sup>, France.*
- 1914 \*BOYLE, Lady, 63 *Queen's Gate, S.W. 7.*
- 1898 \*BRIGGS, Rev. W. A., M.D., *Chiang Rai, Laos, via Moulmein and Raheng, Burma.*
- 1907 \*§BROWN, R. Grant, I.C.S., *East India United Service, Club, St. James' Sq., S.W. 1.*
- 1917 BROWN, Thomas, *La Roque, Overton Rd., Sutton, Surrey.*
- 1889\*†§BROWNE, Edward Granville, M.A., F.B.A., *Adams Professor of Arabic; Pembroke College, and Firwood, Trumpington Rd., Cambridge.*
- 1919 BROWNESS, G., F.C.S., *Talnas Grove Rd., Spring Bank, Wigan.*
- 1919 BRUCE, J. C., *Twin Oaks, Essex Fells, New Jersey, U.S.A.*
- 90 1907 \*BRUNTON, Captain Chisholm Dunbar, 6 *Learmouth Place, Edinburgh.*
- 1919 BRYCE, W. Moir, 11 *Blackford Rd., Edinburgh.*
- 1908 \*BÜCHLER, Dr. A., *Jews' College, London; 27 College Crescent, N.W. 8.*
- 1919 BUDGE, E. A. Wallis, Litt.D., F.S.A., *British Museum, W.C. 1.*
- 1906 \*†BURDWAN, Dhiraj Sir Bijay Chand Mahtab Bahadur Maharaja of, K.C.S.I., K.C.I.E., *The Palace, Burdwan, Bengal.*
- 1919 BURKITT, F. C., *West Road Corner, Cambridge.*
- 1897 \*BURN, Richard, C.S.I., *c/o Messrs. Grindlay & Co., 54 Parliament St., S.W. 1.*

- 1918 \*BURROWES, Major H. O. A. D., 39th *Battalion, A.I.F.*  
 1918 BUSSELL, Rev. F. W., D.D., *Northolt Rectory, Middlesex.*
- HON. 1913 CAETANI, LEONE, *Principe di Teano, Palazzo Caetani, Via Botteghe Oscure, Rome, Italy.*
- 100 1886 \*†CAMA, Jehangir K. R., 12 *Malabar Hill, Bombay.*  
 1867 \*†CAMA, K. R., *Mount House, Victoria Rd., Mazagone, Bombay.*
- 1919 CAMPBELL, Dr. Colin, *Ach-na-cloich, Rosneath, Scotland.*
- 1887 \*†CAMPBELL, Rev. W., D.D., 50 *St. Michael's Rd., Bournemouth.*
- 1890 \*CARPENTER, Rev. J. Estlin, D.Litt., 11 *Marston Ferry Rd., Oxford.*
- 1888 HON. 1919. CASARTELLI, The Right Rev. L. C., *Bishop of Salford, St. Bede's College, Manchester.*
- 1914 CATT, Rev. David, *Emmanuel Church Parsonage, Sutton Court Rd., Chiswick, W. 4.*
- 1917 \*CHAKRAVARTI, Phani B., B.A., *Sub-Deputy Magistrate and Collector, Burdwan, Bengal.*
- 1899 \*CHAKRAVARTI, Rai Bahadur M. Mohun, M.A., 14 *Palmer Bazar Rd., P.O. Nth. Entally, Calcutta.*
- 1916 \*CHALMERS, The Right Hon. Sir Robert, G.C.B., *The Treasury, Whitehall, S.W. 1.*
- 110 1877 \*CHAMBERLAIN, Basil Hall, 2 *Rue de l'Athénée, Geneva, Switzerland.*
- 1895 \*†CHAND, Dewan Tek.
- 1915 \*CHAND, Hari, I.C.S., *Batala, Panjab, India.*
- 1919 \*CHANDRA, Ram, B.A., LL.B., *Professor Gurukul University, Haridwar, and 14/41 Orderly Bazar, Benares Coutt, U.P., India.*
- 1914 \*†CHATHOORBHOOJADASS, Dewan Bahadur Govindass, 459 *Mint St., George Town, Madras, E. C.*
- 1912 \*CHATTERJEE, Babu Arun Chandra, *Medical Practitioner, Nabadwip, Nadia, Bengal.*
- 1915 CHATTERJEE, The Hon. Mr. M. Atul Chandra, I.C.S., *Secretary to Government of United Provinces, Lucknow, India.*
- 1918 \*CHATTERJEE, H. N., M.D., c/o Mr. J. N. Ghose, 23/3 *Ray St., Bhowani Pun, Calcutta.*



- 1916 \*CHATTERJEE, Jnananjan, Vidyabinode, *Kasinagar P.O., Jessore, Bengal.*
- 1915 \*CHATURVEDY, Pandit Shiv Kumar, B.A., *Secretary, Jhalawar State Council, Jhalrapatan, Rajputana, India.*
- 120 1915 \*CHAUDHURI, Babu Hemanga Ch. *Zamindar and Hon. Magistrate, Sherpur Town P.O., Mymensingh, Bengal.*
- 1914 \*CHAUDHURI, Charu Chandra, Rai Bahadur, *Zamindar and Honorary Magistrate, Sherpur Town P.O., Mymensingh, Bengal.*
- 1914 \*CHAUDHURI, Babu Gopaldas, *Zamindar, 32 Beadon Row, Calcutta.*
- 1916 \*CHAUDHURI, Umes Chandra Sinha, *Asst. Master Dutt H.E. School, Netrakona P.O., Mymensingh, Bengal.*
- 1915 \*CHAUDHURY, Babu Hirankumar Roy, *Zamindar, Basanta, Barisal, Bengal.*
- 1917 \*CHIRAKKAL, H.H. Raja Rama Varma, *Valia Raja of, Baliapattam P.O., North Malabar, South India.*
- 1918 \*CHIZEN-AKAMUMA, *Shin-shu Otani, Daigaku, Kuramaguchi, Kyoto, Japan.*
- 1914 \*CHOLMELEY, N. G., C.S.I., I.C.S. (ret.), *Uphill, Bude, Cornwall.*
- 1917 \*CHOUDHURY, Babu Sarat Chandra Roy, *Mulghar, Khulnar, Barisal, Bengal.*
- 1917 \*CHOWDHURY, Babu Surendra Nath Roy, M.A., *Headmaster, Oriental Training Academy, Calcutta.*
- 130 1885 \*†CHURCHILL, Sidney.
- 1919 \*CLARK, Dr. Walter E., *Professor of Sanskrit, University of Chicago, Ill., U.S.A.*
- 1912 \*CLAUSON, Capt. Gerard L. M., O.B.E., *39a Clanricarde Gardens, W. 2.*
- 1904 \*CLEMENTI, C., *Government Secretary's Office, Georgetown, British Guiana, South America.*
- 1911 \*CLIFTON, Rev. Edward James, *17 Brunswick Sq., Herne Bay, Kent.*
- 1899 \*CLOUGH, Mrs. E. Rauschenbusch, *30 Winthrop St., Rochester, New York, U.S.A.*
- 1907 \*COCHRAN, Alexander Smith, *Yonkers, New York, U.S.A.*

- 1910 \*COCHRANE, Rev. Wilbur Willis, *Missionary, Hsipaw, Northern Shan States, Burma.*
- 1910 \*†CODRINGTON, Humphrey W., *c/o Secretariat, Colombo, Ceylon.*
- 1877 §CODRINGTON, Oliver, M.D., F.S.A., HON. VICE-PRESIDENT, *Wootton, 10 Ailea Rd., St. Margaret's-on-Thames.*
- 140 1909 \*COHEN, Samuel J., *11 Peter St., Manchester.*
- 1913 \*COHN, Dr. William, Ph.D., *Herausgeber des Ost-asiatischen Zeitschrift, Kurfürstendamm 97-8, Halensee, Berlin.*
- 1908 COLDSTREAM, W., I.C.S. (ret.), *69 West Cromwell Rd., S.W. 5.*
- 1912 \*COLLINS, Godfrey F. S., I.C.S., *c/o Messrs. Grindlay and Co., Bombay.*
- 1919 COOKE, Richard, *The Croft, Detling, Maidstone.*
- 1906 \*†COOMARASWAMY, Ananda K., D.Sc., F.G.S., F.L.S., *Keeper of Indian Art, Museum of Fine Arts, Boston, Mass., U.S.A.*
- HON. 1893 CORDIER, Prof. Henri, *8 Rue de Siam, Paris, XVI<sup>e</sup>, France.*
- 1888 COUSENS, Henry, *Late Superintendent, Archaeological Survey of India, Western Circle, Longfield, Cavendish Rd., Redhill.*
- 1915 \*COWLEY, A. E., *Magdalen College, and 94 St. Aldate's, Oxford.*
- 1879 \*CRAIG, W., *Brisbane, Queensland, Australia.*
- 150 1912 \*CRESWELL, Capt. K. A. C., *H. 2, Middle East Brigade, Egyptian Expeditionary Force.*
- 1919 CRUM, W. E., *171 Pitshanger Lane, Ealing, W. 5.*
- 1915 \*CUMMING, John Guest, *United Service Club, Calcutta.*
- 1909 CURZON OF KEDLESTON, The Right Hon. Earl, K.G., G.C.S.I., G.C.I.E., F.R.S., *Hackwood, near Basingstoke, Hants.*
- 1908 \*DAICHES, Dr. Samuel, *Professor, Jews' College, Guildford St., W.C. 1.*
- 1891 \*†D'ALVIELLA, M. le Comte Goblet, *Rue Faider 10, Brussels, Belgium.*

- 1884 §DAMES, M. Longworth, I.C.S. (ret.), JOINT HON. SECRETARY, VICE-PRESIDENT, *Crichmere, Edgeborough Rd., Guildford.*
- 1909 \*DANDAY, Rev. G., S.J., *St. Mary's, Kurseong, India.*
- 1918 \*DAS, Babu Mahin Chandra, B.A., *Secretary, Kandol H.E. School, P.O. Fulgazi, Dt. Noakhali, Bengal.*
- 1916 \*DAS-GUPTA, Nibaranchandra, B.A., *Sub-Deputy Collector, Mymensingh, Bengal.*
- 160 1917 \*DASJI, Rajvaid S. R. Kaviraj, 152 *Harrison Rd., Calcutta.*
- 1913 \*DATTA, Jnanindra Nath, *Superintendent of Post Offices, Sylhet, India.*
- 1915 \*DAVAR, Amolak Raj, *Municipal Office, Jullundur City, Panjab, India.*
- 1904 \*DAVAR, M. B., M.A., Ph.D., 89 *Lamington Rd., Bombay.*
- 1915 \*DAVIES, Rev. A. W., *St. John's College, Agra, India.*
- 1894 \*†DAVIES, Rev. T. Witton, B.A., Ph.D., D.D., *Professor of Semitic Languages, University College of North Wales, Bryn Haul, Bangor, N. Wales.*
- 1910 \*DAVIS, Lady, 20 *Basil Mansions, Knightsbridge, S.W. 1.*
- 1918 DAWUD, Yuhanna, *c/o Messrs. Vincent Robinson & Co., Ltd., 34 Wigmore Street, W. 1.*
- 1919 \*†DEBBARMAN, Pyari Mohan, B.Sc., *Botanical Survey of India, R. Botanical Gardens, Sibpur, Calcutta; Agartala, Tipperah, Bengal.*
- 1913 \*DEEN, Muhammad, M.D., *Household Officer Dera Nawab Sahib, Bahawalpur State, India.*
- 170 HON. 1908 DELITZSCH, Dr. Friedrich, *Professor of Oriental Philology, University of Berlin; 135 Kurfürstendamm, Halensee, Berlin.*
- 1908 \*DESIKA-CHARI, Diwan Bahadur T., *High Court Vakil, Cantonment, Trichinopoly, Madras.*
- 1896 \*DEUSSEN, Professor P., 39 *Beseler-allee, Kiel, Germany.*
- 1912 \*DEVA, Professor Rama, *The Gurukula, Mahavidyala, Kangri, P. O. Shampur, Dt. Bijnor, U.P., India.*
- 1904 \*DEWHURST, Robert Paget, M.A., I.C.S., *Lonsdale, Langton Rd., Worthing.*

- 1915 \*DEX, Kumud Lall, *Hon. Magistrate, Barabazar, Chinsurah Dt., Hoogly, India.*
- 1908 \*DHANINIVAT, Mom Chow, *Talat Noi House, Bangkok, Siam.*
- 1914 DICKINSON, Miss M. Lowes, *Shottersley, Haslemere, Surrey.*
- 1908 \*†DIN, Malik Muhammad, *General Manager, Estates of the Nawab of Karnal, Karnal, Panjab, India.*
- 1904 DOBRÉE, Alfred, *11 Palace St., S.W. 1.*
- 180 1894 \*D'OLDENBURG, Serge, Ph.D., *Professor of Sanskrit, The University, Petrograd, Russia.*
- 1919 DONALDSON, Rev. E., *Pyworthy Rectory, Holsworthy, Devon.*
- 1910 \*DRAKE-BROCKMAN, D. L., I.C.S., *Allahabad, U.P.; c/o Messrs. T. Cook & Son, Bombay.*
- 1917 \*DURAI, Samuel Abraham, B.A., *Government High School, Rangoon, Burma.*
- 1907 §DURAND, The Right Hon. Sir Henry Mortimer, G.C.M.G., K.C.S.I., *DIRECTOR, Penmayne House, Rock, Wadebridge, Cornwall.*
- 1917 \*DUTT, Professor Anakul C., *College House, Bareilly, U.P., India.*
- 1917 \*DUTT, D., M.A., *Krishnachandra College, Hetampur, Birbhum Dt., Bengal.*
- 1916 \*DUTT, Babu Dharanidhar, B.A., *Asst. Headmaster, Nepal, India.*
- 1917 \*DUTT, Lalita Prasad, *181 Maniktola Street, Calcutta.*
- 1915 \*DVIVEDI, Pandit Mannan, *Tahsildar of Ahraula, Azamgarh Dt., U.P., India.*
- 190 1905 \*EDWARDS, E., *Oriental Books and MSS. Department, British Museum, W.C. 1.*
- 1905 \*ELIOT, Sir Charles, K.C.M.G., C.B., *Vice-Chancellor, The University, Hong-Kong, China.*
- 1897 §ELLIS, Alexander George, M.A., *Hon. Librarian, 32 Willow Road, N.W. 3.*
- 1919 ELLIS, Miss M. F., *10 Alexandra Rd., Gloucester.*
- 1919 ELY, Alex. Kirkpatrick, *Very Rev. Dean of, The Deanery, Ely.*
- 1907 \*ENTHOVEN, R. E., I.C.S., *6 Herbert Crescent, S.W. 1.*

- 1904 \*ETTINGHAUSEN, Dr. Maurice L., 170 *Finchley Rd.*,  
*N.W. 3.*
- 1919 EVE, Ella, Lady, *The Alexandra Club*, 12 *Grosvenor St.*, *W. 1.*
- 1911 \*FANOUS, L. A., 49 *Kasr el-Nil St.*, *Cairo, Egypt.*
- 1902 FANSHAWE, Herbert Charles, C.S.I., 72 *Philbeach Gardens*, *S.W. 5.*
- 200 1881 \*†FARGUES, J., 92 *Boulevard de Deuil*, *Montmorency, Seine et Oise, France.*
- 1880 \*†FARIDOUN, Jung Bahadur, Nawab Sir, K.C.I.E., C.S.I., *Sadr-ul-Maham to H.H. the Nizam of Hyderabad, Deccan, India.*
- 1916 \*FARQUHAR, J. N., D.Litt., 11 *Frenchay Rd.*, *Oxford.*
- 1914 \*FATAH, Moulvi Syed Abul, K.-i-H., *Zamindar, Rangpur, Bengal.*
- 1877 \*†FERGUSON, A. M., *Frognaal House, Hampstead, N.W. 3.*
- 1914 \*FERGUSON, John C., Ph.D., 91 *Arlington St.*, *Newton, Mass., U.S.A.*
- 1901 \*FERGUSON, J. C., I.C.S., *c/o Messrs. H. S. King & Co., 9 Pall Mall, S.W. 1.*
- 1907 \*FERRAR, Major M. L., *c/o Messrs. Grindlay & Co., Bombay.*
- 1887 FINN, Mrs., *The Elms, Brook Green, W. 6.*
- 1893 \*FINOT, Louis, *Directeur adjoint à l'école des Hautes Études*, 11 *Rue Poussin, Paris, XVI<sup>e</sup>, France.*
- 210 1912 \*FOLEY, Miss Mary C., 51 *Elm Park Mansions, S.W. 10.*
- 1909 §FOSTER, William, C.I.E., *Registrar and Superintendent of Records, India Office, S.W. 1.*
- HON. 1918. FOUCHER, A., 286 *Boulevard Raspail, Paris, XIV<sup>e</sup>.*
- 1907 \*FRASER, Charles I., *Council Office, West Montreal, Canada.*
- 1916 FRAZER, Sir J. G., 1 *Brick Court, Middle Temple, E.C. 4.*
- 1918 FRAZER, Mrs. R. W., *The Hollies, Balcomb, Sussex.*
- 1919 †FREKE, Major W. J., V.D., F.S.A., *Stonygate, Leicester.*
- 1909 \*FRIEND-PEREIRA, J. E., *Extra Assistant Commissioner, Goalpara, Assam, India, c/o Messrs. King, Hamilton & Co., Calcutta.*

- 1912 FULTON, Alexander Strathern, *Oriental Books and MSS. Department, British Museum, W.C. 1.*
- 1918 \*FURLANI, Giuseppe, Ph.D., LL.D., *Via del Babuino 186, III, p. Rome.*
- 220 1899 \*GAIT, Sir Edmund Albert, K.C.S.I., C.I.E., *Lieut.-Governor, Bihar and Orissa, India.*
- 1919 \*GANESIER, T. S., M.A., L.T., *Asst. Professor, National College of Commerce, Kilpauk, Madras.*
- 1916 \*GANGOLY, O. C., B.A., *12/1 Gangoly's Lane, Calcutta.*
- 1912 \*GANGULY, Babu Manomohan, *District Engineer, 22 Mirzapur St., Calcutta.*
- 1919 GARDINER, Alan H., *9 Lansdowne Rd., W. 11.*
- 1915 \*GARR, Banarsi Lall, B.Sc., *State Engineer, Poonch State, Kashmir.*
- 1919 GARSTANG, John, D.Sc., *Professor of Archæology, University of Liverpool, Hilbre House, Freshfield, Lancs.*
- 1890 §GASTER, M., Ph.D., *193 Maida Vale, W. 9.*
- 1865 †GAYNER, C., M.D.
- 1912 \*GEDEN, Rev. A. S., *Royapettah, Harpenden, Herts.*
- 230 1906 \*†GEIL, William Edgar, M.A., LL.D., Litt.D., *Doylestown, Pennsylvania, U.S.A.*
- 1919 GETTY, Miss Alice, *75 Av. des Champs Elysées, Paris.*
- 1916 \*GHANI, Muhammad Abdul, Sahib Bahadur, B.A., *Lecturer, Police Training School, Vellore, South India.*
- 1918 \*GHATE, Professor V. S., *Elphinstone College, Bombay.*
- 1918 \*GHOSE, Nagendra Nath, B.A., *Chief Clerk, Law Dept., Calcutta Corporation, 10 Maniktola Rd., Calcutta.*
- 1918 \*GHOSH, Babu Sudhi Chandra, *Deputy Magistrate and Collector and Asst. Settlement Officer i/c Jessore, Bengal.*
- 1908 \*GHOSH, Wopendranath, Rai Bahadur, *Magistrate Huzaribagh, Bengal.*
- 1893 \*†GIBSON, Mrs. J. Young, LL.D., *Castlebrae, Cambridge.*
- 1919 GILES, Lionel, M.A., D.Litt., *Dept. of Oriental Books British Museum, 13 Whitehall Gardens, Acton Hill, W. 3.*
- 1910 GILLESPIE, J., *The Homestead, Elsworth Rd., N.W. 3.*

- 240 1912 \*GIPPERICH, H., *Commercial Attaché to H.I.G.M.'s Consulate, Tientsin, China (via Siberia).*
- 1916 \*GODDARD, Rev. W. G., M.S.A., *The Parsonage, Sandgate, Brisbane, Queensland, Australia.*
- HON. 1893 GOLDZIEHER, Professor Ignaz, vii *Holló-utza 4, Budapest, Hungary.*
- 1900 \*GONDAL, H.H. the Thakur Sahib, G.C.I.E., *Gondal, Kathiawar, India.*
- 1884 \*†GORPARSHAD, Thakur, *Talukdar of Baiswar, Aligarh, India.*
- 1912 \*GOUGH, Rev. Percival, M.A., *Heptonstall Vicarage, Hebden Bridge, Yorks.*
- 1910 \*GRAHAM, W. A., *Adviser to the Ministry of Agriculture, Bangkok, Siam.*
- 1919 †GRAVES, R. E., *6 Grange Park, Ealing, W. 5.*
- 1916 \*GRAY, Rev. G. Buchanan, D.Litt., *33 Norham Rd., Oxford.*
- 1919 GREEN, F. W., *Whitefield, Great Shelford, Cambridge.*
- 250 1918 GREENSHIELDS, Robert Scott, I.C.S. (ret.), *16 St. James's Square, S.W. 1.*
- 1893 \*GREENUP, Rev. Albert W., D.D., *The Principal's Lodge, St. John's Hall, Highbury, N. 5.*
- 1884 §GRIERSON, Sir George A., K.C.I.E., Ph.D., I.C.S. (ret.), *HON. SECRETARY, Rathfarnham, Camberley, Surrey.*
- 1919 GRIFFITH, F. Ll., *11 Norham Gardens, Oxford.*
- 1897 §GUEST, A. Rhuvon, *1a Thornton Hill, Wimbledon, S.W. 19.*
- HON. 1898 GUIDI, Professor Ignace, *24 Botteghe Oscure, Rome.*
- 1910 \*GUNAWARDHANA, W. F., *Department of Public Instruction, Rose Villa, Mt. Lavinia, Ceylon.*
- 1915 \*GUPTA, Kumud Bandhu Das, B.A., *4th Presidency Magistrate, 2 Bankshah St., Calcutta.*
- 1913 \*GUPTA, Saurindra Kumar, B.A., B.L. (Calc.), B.A., B.Litt. (Oxford), Ph.D. (Berne), *Barrister-at-Law, Bar Library, Calcutta.*
- 1917 \*GUPTA, Benod Behari Das, *Deputy Commissioner, Barisal, Bengal.*
- 260 1917 \*GUPTA, Ramani R. Sen, *Vidyabinode, Jagajjyoti Office, 1 Buddhist Temple Lane, P.O., Bowbazar, Calcutta.*

- 1894 \*GURDON, Lieut.-Col. Philip R. T., C.S.I., I.A.,  
*Commissioner, Assam Valley Distrs., Gauhati, Assam,  
India.*
- 1918 \*GURU, Kanhaya Lal, *Inspector of Schools, Chattisgarh,  
Circle, Raipur, C.P., India.*
- 1910 \*GYI, Maung Maung, *Resident Excise Officer, Prome,  
Burma.*
- 1916 \*GYI, Maung, B.A., *Township Officer, Lalbala,  
Myangyan Dt., Burma.*
- 1883 \*HAGGARD, Sir W. H. D., K.C.B., *H.B.M. Minister  
Resident and Consul-General to the Republic of the  
Equator.*
- 1902 \*HAGOPIAN, Professor G., 25 Chesilton Rd., S.W. 6.
- 1911 \*HAIG, Kerest, *c/o British Consul, Lausanne, Switzerland.*
- 1898 \*HAIG, Lieut.-Col. T. Wolseley, C.M.G., I.A., *H.B.M.  
Consulate, Ispahan, Persia.*
- 1919 \*HAJELA, Kripa Shankar, M.Sc., LL.B., *Vakil, Gonda,  
Oudh, India.*
- 270 HALL, H. R., M.A., F.S.A., *British Museum, W.C. 1.*
- 1909 \*HALLIDAY, Robert, *Christian Mission, Nahorn Pathom,  
Siam.*
- 1904 \*HANSON, Rev. O., Litt.D., *Kachin Mission, Namkham,  
via Bhamo, Upper Burma.*
- 1915 \*HARGREAVES, H., *Superintendent of Archaeology, Lahore,  
India.*
- 1910 \*HARLEY, A. H., M.A., *Principal, Madrasah College,  
Calcutta.*
- 1913 \*HARPER, Rev. Robert, M.D., *Northern Shan States,  
Namkham, via Bhamo, Burma.*
- 1919 HARRIS, Dr. Rendel, 54 Wood Rd., *Whalley Range,  
Manchester.*
- 1919 HARRISON, Edgar E., 12 Leopold Rd., *Ealing, W. 5.*
- 1919 HARTLAND, Ernest, *Hardwick Court, Chepstow.*
- 1918 \*HAYES, Herbert E. E., *Missionary, Masken-es-Salaam,  
Ezbet-el-Zeitoun, Egypt.*
- 280 1919 HEAPE, Chas., *High Lane, Cheshire, via Stockport.*
- \*†HEMING, Lieut.-Col. Dempster.
- 1919 HERBERT, Miss Jane C., 45 Oakley St., *S.W. 3.*
- 1911 \*HERTEL, Professor Johannes, *Leisnigerstrasse 24,  
Grossbauchlitz bei Döbeln, Saxony.*



- 1912 \*HILDITCH, John, *Minglands, Crumpsall Lane, Crumpsall, Manchester.*
- 1901 \*HILL, Rev. J. R., *S.P.G. Mission, Banda, U.P., India.*
- 1913 HILL, S. C., *Ind. Educ. Serv. (ret.), 36 West Heath Drive, N.W. 3.*
- 1914 \*HILLELSON, S., *Gordon College, Khartoum, Sudan.*
- 1885 \*†HIPPISEY, Alfred E., *late Commissioner of Chinese Customs, 8 Herbert Crescent, S.W. 1.*
- 1891 \*HIRSCHFELD, H., Ph.D., *Lecturer on Semitics at the Jews' University Colleges; 14 Randolph Gardens, N.W. 6.*
- 290 1919 HODGEKINSON, Rev. J. P., *13 Swinley Rd., Wigan, Lancs.*
- 1918 \*HOGG, J. Drummond, *H.B.M. Consular Service, British Legation, Bangkok, Siam.*
- 1919 HOLLINGWORTH, E. W., *7 Gladstone Rd., Broadstairs.*
- 1906 \*HOLM, Hon. Frits, G.C.O.M., G.C.C.M., K.C.R., LL.D., D.C.L., *Commissioner of the Cuban Red Cross; c/o Royal Danish Consulate, New York City, U.S.A.*
- 1915 HOLMWOOD, Lady, *Aldbourn, Stoke Poges Lane, near Slough, Bucks.*
- 1919 HOLMYARD, E. J., B.A., *120 High St., Marlborough, Wills.*
- 1911 \*HOPKINS, E. Washburn, *Professor of Sanskrit, Yale University, 299 Lawrence St., Newhaven, Conn., U.S.A.*
- 1889 §HOPKINS, Lionel Charles, I.S.O., *The Garth, Haslemere.*
- 1908 HORNELL, William Woodward, *Ind. Educ. Serv., Office of the Director of Public Instruction, Bengal, Writers' Buildings, Calcutta.*
- HON. 1902 HOUTSMA, Professor, *The University, Utrecht, Holland.*
- 300 1919 HOWORTH, Sir Henry Hoyle, K.C.I.E., D.C.L., F.R.S., *45 Lexham Gardens, W. 8.*
- 1917 \*HOWARTH, Major Li A., *Political Agent, Muscat, Persian Gulf.*
- 1919 HOYTEMA, D. van, *Valeriusstraat, 92, Amsterdam.*
- 1908 \*†HYDE, James H., *11 East Fortieth St., New York City, U.S.A.; 18 Rue Adolphe Yvon, Paris.*

- 1918 \*IMAM, Saiyyid Haider, *Ashraf Manzil, Muradpore P. O., Patna, Bengal.*
- 1893 \*INNES, John R., *Straits Civil Service, Singapore.*
- 1918 ISPAHANI, M. H., 21 *Mincing Lane, E. C. 3.*
- 1914 \*IYER, Balasundaraman C. S., 4 *N.E. Diagonal Rd., Basavangudi, Bangalore, Madras Presidency.*
- 1916 \*IYER, K. Ramaswami, *Handel Maatschappij, Deli Atjeh, Medan, East Coast of Sumatra.*
- 1906 \*JACKSON, A. V. Williams, LL.D., Litt. D., *Professor of Indo-Iranian Languages, Columbia University, New York City, U.S.A.*
- 310 HON. 1912 JACOBI, Dr. Hermann, Geh. Regierungsrat, *Sanskrit Professor, 59 Niebuhrstrasse, Bonn, Germany.*
- 1916 \*JAINI, Jagmandir Lal, M.A., *Judge of the High Court of Judicature, Indore State, Central India.*
- 1901 \*JARDINE, W. E., C.I.E., *The Residency, Gwalior, Central India.*
- 1917 \*JASPAL, Raghubir Singh, M.A., *Kapurthala, Panjab, India.*
- 1883 \*†JAYAMOHUN, Thakur Singh, *Tahsildar of Seori Narayan, Bilaspur, Central Provinces, India.*
- 1918 \*JAYATILAKA, Don Baron, B.A., *Advocate of the Supreme Court of Ceylon, Union Society, Oxford.*
- 1914 \*JHA, Ganganatha, *Professor of Sanskrit, Muir Central College, Allahabad, India.*
- 1911 \*†JHALAWAR, H.H. the Maharaj Rana Sir Bhawani Singh, Sahib Bahadur, K.C.S.I. of, *Jhalrapatan, Rajputana, India.*
- 1900 \*JINARAJADASA, C., *c/o Theosophical Society, Adyar, Madras.*
- 1882 \*†JINAVARAVANSA, Rev. P. C., *Buddhist Bhikshu (formerly His Excellency Prince Prisdang), Dipaduttama Arama, Kotahena, Colombo, Ceylon.*
- 320 1909 \*JOHNSTON, Edward Hamilton, *c/o Messrs. Grindlay and Co., Calcutta.*
- 1904 \*JOHNSTON, Reginald Fleming, *Secretary to Government, Wei-hai-wei, China.*
- HON. 1904 JOLLY, Professor Julius, *The University, Würzburg, Bavaria.*

- 1919 JONES, H. Sefton, 74 *Cadogan Place, S.W. 1*; 285  
*High Holborn, W.C. 1.*
- 1908 \*JOPP, Charles Henry Keith, M.A., I.C.S. (ret.),  
*Reader in Marathi, 16 Linton Rd., Oxford.*
- 1911 \*JOWETT, Rev. Hardy, H.Q. *Base Depot, Chinese  
Labour Corps. B.E.F.*  
JUDD, George H., F.R.G.S., 48 *Chestnut Rd., West  
Norwood, S.E.*
- 1918 \*KAK, Ram Chandra, *c/o Director - General of  
Archæology, Simla, India.*
- 1917 \*KALIA, D. R., M.B.E., *Ferozapore, Panjab, India.*
- 1907 \*KANIKA, Rajendra Narayan Bhanja Deo, Raja of,  
*Kanika, Orissa, India.*
- 330 1916 \*KAPUR, Kanshi Ram, *Chief Agent Empire of India  
Life Assurance Co., Kapur Buildings, Lahore, India.*
- HON. 1899 KARABAČEK, K. u. K. Hofrat, Professor J. Ritter  
von, *Vienna, Austria.*
- 1909 \*KEITH, Alan Davidson, *Professor of English, Rangoon  
College, Rangoon, Burma.*
- 1919 †KEITH, C. P., 308 *Walnut St., Philadelphia, Pa.,  
U.S.A.*
- 1891 §KENNEDY, James, I.C.S. (ret.), HON. TREASURER,  
51 *Palace Gardens Terrace, W. 8.*
- 1895 \*KENNEDY, Miss Louise, *Fairacre, Concord, Mass.,  
U.S.A.*
- 1909 \*KENNEDY, Pringle, M.A., *Muzaffarpur, Bengal, India.*
- 1914 \*KENT, A. S., *c/o Chinese Post Office, Mukden,  
Manchuria.*
- 1908 \*KESTEVEN, C. H., *Bengal Club, Calcutta.*
- 1915 \*KHAN, Dr. Ahmad, *Mohsenzadeh, Tehran, Persia, via  
Baku, Russia.*
- 340 1916 \*KHAN, the Hon. Chaudhuri Mohammed Ismail,  
*Zamindar of Barisal, Bengal.*
- 1911 \*KHAN, Mahomed Hasan, Khan Bahadur, *Asst.  
Accountant General, United Provinces, 11b Clive  
Rd., Allahabad, India.*
- 1909 \*KINCAID, C. A., C.V.O., I.C.S., *Secretary to Government,  
Bombay, Political, Special, and Judicial Depart-  
ments; c/o Messrs. Grindlay & Co., 54 Parliament  
St., S.W. 1.*

- 1916 \*§KING, Leonard W., M.A., F.S.A., *Professor of Assyriology, King's College, London, 29 St. Edmund's Terrace, N.W. 8* (deceased Aug., 1919).
- 1884 \*KING, Sir Lucas White, C.S.I., LL.D., F.S.A., I.C.S., (ret.), *Professor of Arabic, Persian, and Hindustani, Dublin University; Roebuck Hall, Co. Dublin.*
- 1884 \*†KIRTS, Eustace John, *Dudley Hotel, Hove, Sussex.*
- 1919 KNOX-SHAW, C., *Waverley, Oxted, Surrey.*
- 1914 \*KO, Maung Ba, *Extra Asst. Commissioner, Prome, Burma.*
- 1916 \*KOCHAR, D. R., B.Sc., *Divisional Engineer, West Berar Divn., Akola, C.P., India.*
- 1917 \*KOHLI, Gokalchand, *Barrister-at-Law, Peshawar, N.W.F.P., India.*
- 350 1916 \*KONOW, Dr. Sten, *Sorgen Frigate 9, Christiania, Norway.*
- 1906 \*KREMKOW, Fritz, *The Hawthorns, Quorn, near Loughborough.*
- 1913 \*KRISHNAMACHARIAR, M., M.A., M.L., Ph.D., *Tanuku, Kistna Dist., Madras Pres.*
- 1911 \*KROM, N. J., Ph.D., *Director of Archæology in Netherlands India, Van Bleiswijkstraat 73a, The Hague, Holland.*
- HON. 1909 KUHN, Geheimer Rat Professor Ernst, Ph.D., *Hess-strasse 5, Munich, Bavaria.*
- 1909 \*KULANDAISWAMI, R. P., *Head Master, St. Joseph's High School, Trivandrum, Travancore, South India.*
- 1913 \*KUNWAR, Har Pratap Singh, B.Sc., *Nahan, Sirmun State, Panjab, India.*
- 1912 \*LABBERTON, Dr. D. van Hinloopen, *Lecturer in Indonesian Linguistics, Government College, 1 Blavatsky Park, Weltevreden, Java, Dutch Indies.*
- 1910 \*LADDU, J. K., Ph.D., *Professor of Sanskrit, Queen's College, Benares, U.P. India.*
- 1919 \*LAL, Babu Chhail Bihari, M.A., LL.B., *Supt. of Stamps, Jalrapatan, Rajputana, India.*
- 360 1904 \*LAL, Hira, Rai Bahadur, B.A., *Extra Assistant Commissioner, Jubbulpore, C.P., India.*

- 1917 \*LAL, Lala Ikhtiar, Dhawan, B.A., *Bhundian St., Patiala, Panjab, India.*
- 1919 \*LAL, Lala Mohan, M.A., *Head Master, Dt. Board High School, Rahon, Panjab, India.*
- 1904 \*LAL, Raja Madho, C.S.I., *Chowkhumba, Benares, India.*
- 1910 \*LAL, Shyam, M.A., LL.B., *Deputy Collector, Nawalgarh, Cawnpore, India.*
- 1918 \*LAL, Ohhuttan Swami, *Swami Press, Meerut, Panjab, India.*
- 1915 \*LAMB, Miss M. Antonia, *212 South 46th St., Philadelphia, Pa., U.S.A.*
- 1902 \*LANDBERG, Count C., *Villa Kraft, 2 Avenue Désambrois, Nice, France.*
- 1917 \*LANGDON, S., Ph.D., *17 Northmoor Rd., Oxford.*
- 1880 HON. 1902 LANMAN, Charles R., *Professor of Sanskrit, Harvard University, 9 Farrar St., Cambridge, Mass., U.S.A.*
- 370 1884 \*†LANSDELL, Rev. Henry, D.D., *Dimsdale, 4 Pond Rd., Blackheath Park, S.E. 3.*
- 1911 \*LAUFER, Dr. Berthold, *Field Museum, Chicago, Ill., U.S.A.*
- 1914 \*LAW, Balu Bimala Charan, B.A., *Zamindar, 24 Sukea's St., Calcutta.*
- 1874 LAWRENCE, F. W., *Hillcote, Lansdown, Bath.*
- 1901 \*LEADBEATER, C. W., *69 Hunter St., Sydney, N.S.W., Australia.*
- 1900 \*LECHMERE-OERTEL, The Hon. Mr. F. O., *Chief Engineer, Shillong, Assam, India.*
- 1907 LEECHMAN, George Barclay, *50 Campden House Court, W. 8.*
- 1918 LEGG, Rev. Stanley C. E., *Teacher in Theology, London University; 4 Down St., W. 1.*
- 1899 §LEGG, F., F.S.A., *6 Gray's Inn Square, W.C. 1.*
- 1896 \*LEIGH, Col. H. P. P., C.I.E., *Grosvenor House, Bath.*
- 380 1878 \*†LEPPER, C. H.
- 1910 \*LESNÝ, Dr. V., *Ujézd 595, Prag, Bohemia.*
- 1880 †LE STRANGE, Guy, *63 Panton St., Cambridge.*
- 1890 \*LEVESON, Henry G. A., I.C.S., *70 Carlisle Mansions, Victoria St., S.W. 1.*
- HON. 1917 LÉVI, Sylvain, *9 Rue Guy de la Brosse, Paris.*

- 1912 \*LEVONIAN, Professor Lootfy, *Central Turkey College, Aintab, Aleppo, Turkey in Asia.*
- 1885 †LEWIS, Mrs. A. S., LL.D., *Castlebrae, Cambridge.*
- 1897 \*LINDSAY, Rev. James, M.A., D.D., B.Sc., *Annick Lodge, Irvine, Ayrshire, N.B.*
- 1912 \*LIPSHYTZ, Rev. C. T., *Gorrings Park House, Mitcham, Surrey.*
- 1879 \*LOCKHART, Sir J. H. Stewart, K.C.M.G., *Commissioner, Wei-hai-wei, China.*
- 390 1919 LONGDON, Miss C. M., 124 *Osmaston Rd., Derby.*
- 1914 \*†LORIMER, Major D. L. R., I.A., *c/o Messrs. Thomas Cook & Sons, Ludgate Circus, E.C. 4.*
- 1915 \*LORIMER, Miss F. M. G., *Stein Collection, British Museum, W.C. 1.*
- 1919 LOXTON, S. E., *Icknield, Little Aston, near Sutton Coldfield, Staffs.*
- 1904 \*LUARD, Major C. Eckford, M.A., I.A., *c/o Messrs. Grindlay & Co., Bombay.*
- 1909 \*LÜDERS, Professor Dr. H., 20 *Sybelstrasse, Charlottenburg, Berlin.*
- 1914 LUMSDEN, Miss Mary, *Warren Cottage, Cranleigh, Surrey.*
- 1918 \*LUSY, Marino M., *Architect, Casa Lusy, via Lazzaletto Vecchio, No. 11, Trieste.*
- 1899 §LYALL, Sir Charles James, K.C.S.I., C.I.E., LL.D., Ph.D., D.Litt., VICE-PRESIDENT, 82 *Cornwall Gardens, S.W. 7.*
- 1910 \*MACARTNEY, C. H. H., *Foxhold, Crookham, near Newbury, Berks.*
- 400 1917 \*MCCLAY, A.G., B.A., *Asst. Secretary, Home Department, Haidarabad State, India.*
- 1919 MCCLURE, Rev. Canon Edmund, 80 *Eccleston Sq., S.W. 1.*
- 1900 \*MACDONALD, Duncan B., *Hartford Theological Seminary, Hartford, Conn., U.S.A.*
- 1882 \*§MACDONELL, Arthur A., M.A., F.B.A., Ph.D., *Boden Professor of Sanskrit, Fellow of Balliol, 6 Chadlington Rd., Oxford.*
- 1916 \*MACDONELL, A. Masters, 33-35 *West 42nd St., New York City, U.S.A.*

- 1887 \*McDouall, William, *Bedra, Kut, Mesopotamia.*
- 1919 McGovern, Wm. Montgomery, *School of Oriental Studies, Finsbury Circus, E. C. 2.*
- 1919 MacGregor, Rev. W., *Bolehall Manor House, Tamworth.*
- 1919 \*MacIvor, Capt. David Randall, M.A., 131 *East 66th St., New York, U.S.A.*
- 1894 \*MacLagan, The Hon. Sir E. D., K.C.I.E., C.S.I., *Secretary to Government of India, Educational Department, Simla, India.*
- 410 1917 \*Mahajan, Suryya Prasad, Rais, *Banker and Zamindar, Gaya, Bihar, India.*
- 1917 \*Mahant, B. N., *King's Inns, Dublin.*
- 1916 \*Majid, Abdul, B.A., *Golaganj, Lucknow, India.*
- 1913 \*Majumdar, Ramesh Chandra, M.A., *Asst. Professor, Calcutta University, Bengal.*
- 1916 \*Mallik, Gunendra Chandra, B.Sc., *c/o S.C. Mallik, Esq., District Judge, Rangpur, Bengal.*
- 1906 \*Mann, Fairman Rackham, *Staff Surgeon, R.N., Submarine Department, Greenock, N.B.*
- 1889 \*§Margoliouth, D. S., M.A., F.B.A., D.Litt., *Professor of Arabic, 88 Woodstock Rd., Oxford.*
- 1914 \*|Marielle, Madame, 1132 *W. 36th Place, Los Angeles, California.*
- 1904 \*Marsden, E., *Ind. Educ. Serv., 12 Ellerdale Rd., N.W. 3.*
- 1917 \*Marshall, Rev. H. I., 18 *Prescott St., Nashua, N.H., U.S.A.*
- 420 1901 \*§Marshall, Sir John, C.I.E., *Director-General of Archaeology, Benmore, Simla, India.*
- 1914 \*Martin, Rev. E. Osborn.
- 1916 \*Marzetti, C. J., *Glenloch Group, Ramboda, Ceylon.*
- 1904 \*|Mawjee, Purshotam Vishram, 14 *Hummam St., Fort, Bombay.*
- 1898 \*Maxwell, W. George, *Straits Civil Service, Singapore.*
- 1905 \*Mazumdar, Babu Bijaya Chandra, *High Court Vakil, 33/1e Lansdowne Rd., Calcutta.*
- 1894 Mead, G. R. S., 47 *Campden Hill Rd., W. 8.*
- 1912 \*Mead, John P., jun., *St. Mary's, Park Rd., Teddington.*

- 1907 \*MEADEN, Rev. H. Anderson, *St. Peter's Parsonage, Stornoway, N.B.*
- 1906 \*MEHTA, Bhaskarrao Vithaldas, M.A., *c/o Lalubhai Samaldas, Esq., 99 Apollo St., Bombay.*
- 430 1918 \*MEHTA, Madan Gopal, *Barrister-at-Law, Abbottabad, N.W.F.P., India.*
- 1918 \*MENZIES, Capt. the Rev. James Mellon, B.A.Sc., *Technical Staff, Chinese Labour Hdqrs., A.P.O., S. 1, B.E.F.*
- 1899 \*MESTON, Sir James Scorgie, K.C.S.I., *Lieutenant-Governor, United Provinces of Agra and Oudh, Allahabad, India.*
- 1909 \*MILNE, Mrs. Leslie, *19 Murrayfield Avenue, Edinburgh.*
- 1913 \*MISRA, Pandit Shyam Behari, M.A., *Asst. Excise Commissioner, 29 Kacheri Rd., Allahabad.*
- 1914 \*MISRA, Syama Behari, Rai Sahib, *Revenue Member of Council of Regency, Jodhpur, Rajputana, India.*
- 1913 MITCHELL, Rev. C.W., *Merchant Taylors' School, E.C.1.*
- 1918 \*MITRA, Satis Chandra, B.A., *Professor Hindu Academy, Daulatpur, Khulna Dt., Bengal.*
- 1903 MITRA, S. M., *39 Westby Rd., Boscombe, Bournemouth.*
- 1914 \*MITRA, Surendranath, *G. T. Survey Dept., Dehra Dun, U.P., India.*
- 440 1916 \*MITTER, P. N., *Consulting Engineer, India Club, 6 Hastings St., Calcutta.*
- 1882 \*†MOHANLAL VISNULAL PANDIA, Pandit, *Gorepārā Mohallā, Muttra, U.P., India.*
- 1917 \*MOITRA, Babu Nalini Kanta, M.A., *68c Beadon St., Calcutta.*
- 1908 \*MONAHAN, F. J., I.C.S., *Commissioner Assam Valley Dts., E. B. & A., c/o Messrs. H. S. King & Co., 9 Pall Mall, S.W. 1.*
- 1919 MOND, R., *Coombe Bank, nr. Sevenoaks.*
- 1901 MONTEFIORE, Claude, *8 Palace Green, W. 8.*
- 1912 \*MOOKERJI, Radhakumud, Ph.D., *26 Sukea's St., Calcutta.*
- 1916 MORELAND, W. H., C.S.I., C.I.E., *Bengeo Old Vicarage, Hertford.*
- 1918 \*MORENO, Henry W. Bunn, B.A., *Professor Central College, Calcutta, 12 Wellesley St., Calcutta.*



- 1909 \*MORRIS, Thomas Walter, I.C.S., *Bulandshahr, U.P., India.*
- 450 1881 MORRISON, Walter, 77 *Cromwell Rd., S.W. 7; Malham Tarn, Bell Busk, Leeds.*
- 1882 \*†MORSE, H. Ballou, LL.D., *Arden, Camberley, Surrey.*
- 1916 \*MUHAMMAD-SADIQ, Mufti, *Professor of Hebrew Language and Literature, 4 Star St., W. 2.*
- 1912 \*MUIN-UD-DIN, Munshi Mohammad, *General Superintendent, Collectorate, Cawnpore, U.P., India.*
- 1914 MUIR, Col. W. J. W., 27 *De Vere Gardens, W. 8.*
- 1911 \*MUKERJEA, Babu Manmatha Nath, M.A., *Sub-divisional Officer, Baraset, 24 Parganas, Bengal.*
- 1882 \*MUKERJI, Phanibhusan, *Director State Education, Indore, Central India.*
- 1916 \*MUKHERJEE, Santosh Kumar, Vidyabhusana, *Editor "The Bansari", 52 Chaulpati Rd., Bhowanipur, Calcutta.*
- 1917 \*MUKHOPADHYAYA, Babu Provas Chandra, Protinatatta Bisharad, 31 *Rajchandra Sen Lane, Harrison Road P.O., Calcutta.*
- 1895 \*MULLER-HESS, Dr. E., *Professor of Sanskrit, Berne University; 47 Effingerstrasse, Berne, Switzerland.*
- 460 1919 †MULLING, J., *Cirencester.*
- 1906 \*MUNRO, Neil Gordon, M.B. and C.M. (Edin.), 39 *Settlement, Yokohama, Japan.*
- 1908 MURRAY, John, M.A., D.L., J.P., F.S.A., 50a *Albemarle St., W. 1.*
- 1912 \*MUSHKAN, Pandit Sundar Narayan, *Old Kotha Parcha St., Farrukhabad, U.P., India.*
- 1917 \*MUTSUDDY, Babu Kali Kinkar, *Pahartali Village, Mahamuni P.O., Chittagong Dt., Bengal.*
- 1919 †MYRES, Professor J. L., 101 *Banbury Rd., Oxford.*
- 1898 \*MYSORE, H.H. the Maharaja Sri, Sir Krishnaraja Wadiar Bahadur, G.C.S.I., *The Palace, Bangalore, South India.*
- 1917 \*NADGOWDA, Shrimant N. K., *Mundargi, Dharwar Dt., Bombay.*
- 1915 \*NAHAR, Puran Chand, M.A., B.L., *Zamindar, 48 Indian Mirror St., Calcutta.*

- 1918 \*NAIDU, Mallein Chengalvarayulu, *Barrister-at-Law*,  
18 *Merchant St., Rangoon.*
- 470 1918 \*NAIR, Dr. Tellicherry Madhavan, *Asst. Medical*  
*Officer, Burma Mines Ltd., Nanttu, Burma.*
- 1907 \*NARASIMEACHAR, R., M.A., *Officer in Charge of Archæ-*  
*ology in Mysore; Mallesvaram, Bangalore, India.*
- 1913 \*NARAYAN, Hon. Raja Rajendra, *Kanika, Ragbati,*  
*Cuttack, India.*
- 1909 \*NARIMAN, G. K., *Mazgaon P. O., Bombay.*
- EXT. 1910 NASIR UL-MULK, H.E. Sir Abul Kasim Khan,  
*G.C.M.G., c/o The Persian Legation, 47 Bramham*  
*Gardens, S.W. 5.*
- 1917 \*NASIRI, Maulvi, N.H., M.A., *Professor, Muir Central*  
*College, Allahabad, U.P., India.*
- 1877 HON. 1895 NAVILLE, Edouard, D.C.L., *Professor of*  
*Egyptology, Geneva University; Malaguy, near*  
*Geneva, Switzerland.*
- 1901 NEILL, J. W., I.C.S. (ret.), 10 *Holland Park Court,*  
*Holland Park Gardens, W. 14.*
- 1900 \*NEVILL, Henry Rivers, I.C.S., *Benares, U.P., India,*
- 1919 NEWTON, Miss Frances E., F.R.G.S., 156 *Sloane*  
*St., S.W.1.; Dar ul Kharub, Haifu, Palestine.*
- 480 1895 \*NICHOLSON, R. A., Litt.D., 12 *Harvey Rd., Cambridge.*
- 1919 NIES, Rev. James B., Ph.D., 51 *Clark St., Brooklyn,*  
*N. Y., U.S.A.*
- 1913 \*NOBEL, Johannes, Ph.D., *Leibnizstrasse 42, Charlotten-*  
*burg, Berlin.*
- HON. 1890 NÖLDEKE, Professor Theodor, 6 *Kaiser-Friedrich-*  
*strasse, Strassburg.*
- 1919 NORDEN, Warner M. van, 7 *West 57th St., New*  
*York City, U.S.A.*
- 1913 \*NORTON, E. L., I.C.S., *Postal Censor's Office, S.P. O.,*  
*Bombay, India.*
- 1919 NORTON, Rev. F. C., *Ditchling Vicarage, Hassocks.*  
*Sussex.*
- 1914 \*NOXCE, Frank, I.C.S., c/o *Messrs. Grindlay & Co.,*  
*Bombay.*
- 1919 OFFORD, J., 94 *Gloucester Rd., S.W. 7.*
- 1919 †OKE, A. W., 32 *Denmark Villas, Hove, Sussex.*

- 490 HON. 1908 OLDENBERG, Prof. Hermann, *Nikolausberger Weg*  
27-29, *Göttingen, Germany.*
- 1912 \*OLDHAM, J. H., M.A., *Editor International Review of*  
*Missions, 18 Succoth Avenue, Edinburgh.*
- 1918 \*†ORMEROD, Rev. E. W., *Christchurch S.P.G. Mission,*  
*Cawnpore, U.P.; 25 Upper Wimpole St., W.1.*
- 1917 \*OSBURN, Lieut.-Col. A., R.A.M.C., D.S.O., *Cour-*  
*lands, Lostwithiel, Cornwall.*
- 1900 \*OSTROGOG, Count Léon, *Rue de Suède, Constantinople,*  
*Turkey.*
- 1909 \*PAIRA-MALL, M.D., *c/o National Bank of India,*  
*Amritsar, India.*
- 1916 \*PANDAY, H., B.A., *Archæological Survey, Patna,*  
*India.*
- 1918 \*PANDE, Pandit Shivadhar, M.A., LL.B., *Professor,*  
*Muir Central College, Allahabad, India.*
- 1917 \*PANIKKAR, K. M., *Kavalam, Alleppey, S. India.*
- 1902 \*PARASNIS, Dattatraya B., *Rao Bahadur, Happy Vale,*  
*Satara, Bombay Presidency.*
- 500 1893 \*§PARGITER, F. E., M.A., I.C.S. (ret.), VICE-PRESIDENT,  
12 *Charlbury Rd., Oxford.*
- 1900 \*†PARLA KIMEDI, The Raja of, *Parla Kimedi, Ganjam,*  
*Madras.*
- 1909 \*PARLETT, Harold G., *H.B.M. Consul, Dairen, Japan.*
- 1911 \*†PATIALA, H.H. Maharaja Dhiraj Sir Bupindar Singh,  
*Mahindra Bahadur, K.C.I.E., Chief of Patiala*  
*State, India.*
- 1919 PATON, David, *University Library, Princeton, N.J.,*  
*U.S.A.*
- 1916 \*PATRANAVIS, Jogesh Chandra, *Landholder of Barory,*  
*P.O. Kytile, Mymensingh, Bengal.*
- 1919 \*PATRANAVIS, Suresh Chandra, *Sub-Registrar, Kendua,*  
*P.O., Dt. Mymensingh, Bengal.*
- 1916 \*PATTERSON, Lieut. W. R., *Censor's Office, Rouen,*  
*France.*
- 1919 \*PÈ, Maung Tun, B.A., *Lecturer, Judson College,*  
*Rangoon, Burma.*
- 1919 †PECKOVER OF WISBECH, Rt. Hon. Lord, LL.D., F.S.A.,  
*Bank House, Wisbech.*

- 510 1909 PENNY, Rev. Frank, *Madras Chaplain (ret.)*, 3 *Park Hill, Ealing, W. 5.*
- 1918 \*PERRERA, Edward Walker, *Member of Council Ceylon Branch R.A.S., Walawwa, Kotte, Ceylon.*
- 1919 PEROWNE, E. S. M., 19 *Coleman St., E.C. 2.*
- 1912 \*PERRY, William James, 7 *York View, Pocklington, East Yorks.*
- 1912 \*PETERS, A. P., *Sub-Divisional Magistrate*, 393 *Belelios Rd., Howrah, Bengal.*
- 1905 \*PETERSEN, F. G., *Abildsgaardsgade, Copenhagen, Denmark.*
- 1913 \*PETHACHI CHETTIAR, M. R. Ry. S. Rm. M. Ct., *Ar.*, *Zamindar of Andipatti, Bishop Bungalow, Trichinopoly, India.*
- 1909 \*PHILBY, Harry St. John Bridger, C.I.E., I.C.S., *Secretary to the Board of Examiners*, 17 *St. Petersburg Place, W. 2.*
- 1906 \*§PHILLOTT, Colonel D. C., M.A., *United Service Club, Pall Mall, S.W. 1; 15 Greville Place, N.W. 6.*
- 1919 PILCHER, E. J., 49 *Charlwood St., S.W. 1.*
- 520 1919 \*PILLAY, G. Hurry Krishna, 2 *Phayre St., Rangoon, Burma.*
- 1919 PILTER, Rev. T. W., *Newlands*, 25 *De Cham Rd., St. Leonards-on-Sea.*
- 1911 \*PIM, Alan William, I.C.S., 11 *Muir Rd., Allahabad, U.P., India.*
- 1881 §PINCHES, Theophilus G., LL.D., *Sippara*, 10 *Oxford Rd., N.W. 6.*
- 1895 \*PITT, St. George Lane Fox, *Travellers' Club, Pall Mall, S.W. 1.*
- 1919 PLUNKETT, Hon. Emmeline M., *Southfield House, Wimbledon Park, S.W. 19.*
- 1893 \*§PLUNKETT, Lieut.-Colonel G. T., R.E., C.B., *Belvedere Lodge, St. Mary's Rd., Wimbledon, S.W. 19.*
- 1916 \*POPE, Miss Amina Ethel, *Deaconess' Home, Lucknow, India.*
- 1893 \*POUSSIN, Professor Louis de la Vallée, *Professeur à l'Université de Gand*, 66 *Avenue Molière, Brussels, Belgium.*
- 1919 †POWELL, Rev. Dr., 32 *Bethune Rd., N. 16.*

- 530 1918 \*POYNTER, Capt. H. E., A.S.C., *c/o Messrs. Baldwins, Ltd., 3 St. Helen's Place, E.C. 3.*
- 1907 \*PRASAD, The Hon. Mr. Narsingh, M.A., *Fakil, High Court, Gorakhpur, U.P., India.*
- 1909 \*PRASAD, Pandit Ganga, M.A., *Subdivisional Officer, Roorki, Dt. Saharanpur, U.P., India.*
- 1917 \*PRASAD, The Hon. Rai Bahadur, M. Ashtbhuja, *Bansi, Basti Dt., U.P., India.*
- 1914 \*PRICE, Morgan Philips, *Tibberton Court, Gloucester.*
- 1917 \*PRINS, W. F. F., F.R.G.S., F.R.C.I., *Calverley House, Cinnamon Gardens, Colombo, Ceylon; Royal Societies Club, St. James' St., S.W. 1.*
- 1905 \*PROCTOR, Henry, *H.M. Stationery Office, Westminster, S.W. 1.*
- 1913 \*PROSADA, Siva, Rai Bahadur, *Junior Secretary, Board of Revenue, Allahabad, U.P., India.*
- 1912 \*PURSER, Rev. W. C. B., M.A., *St. Michael's Mission, Kemendine, Burma.*
- HON. 1908 RADLOFF, Professor Dr. V., *The University, Petrograd, Russia.*
- 540 1909 \*RAJA, Kodungallore Rama Varma, *Special Palace Officer, Trippunithura, Cochin State, India.*
- 1874 \*†RAJANATTAYANUHAR, His Excellency Phya, *Private Secretary to H.M. the King of Siam.*
- 1899 \*RAM, Lāl Sila, F.A.U., *Deputy Collector (ret.), 203 Muthiganj, Allahabad, U.P., India.*
- 1909 \*RAMANATHAN, P., *Solicitor, High Court, Manonmari Vilas, Chintadripet, Madras.*
- 1874 \*†RAMASVAMI, Iyengar B., *Bangalore, Madras.*
- 1915 \*RANDLE, Professor Herbert Niel, M.A., I.E.S., *c/o Cook & Sons, Ludgate Circus, E.C. 4.*
- 1869 †RANSOM, Edwin, *24 Ashburnham Rd., Bedford.*
- 1888 \*§RAPSON, E. J., *Professor of Sanskrit, 8 Mortimer Rd., Cambridge.*
- 1918 \*RATH, Babu Mrityunjoy, Banibhusan, *Kavyatistha of Dakkhin Radas, P.O., Pipli. Dt. Puri, Orissa, India.*
- 1918 \*RAU, Penyalā Satianaraina, *New College, Oxford.*
- 550 1914 \*RAWLINSON, Professor H. G., I.E.S., *Principal Karnatak College, Dharwar, Bombay Presidency.*

- 1917 \*RAY, Babu Jitendranath, B.A., 26 *Mogul St., Rangoon, Burma.*
- 1916 \*RAY, Jamini Bhushan Kabiraj, M.A., M.B., 46 *Beadon St., Calcutta.*
- 1916 \*RAY, K. Birendra Nath, Bahadur, *Proprietor of the Nattore Raj (Junior Branch), P.O. Nattore City, Dt. Rajshahi, Bengal.*
- 1914 \*RAY, Kshemada Kenkar, Smritibhusana, M.A., *Zamindar, 49/1B Harismukherji's Rd., Bhawani-pur, Calcutta.*
- 1912 \*RAY, Sarat Kumar, M.A., *Kumar of Dighapatiya, Dayarampur, Rajshahi, Bengal.*
- 1919 \*READ, F. W., 65 *Harley Rd., Harlesden, N.W. 10.*
- 1892 §REAY, The Right Hon. the Lord, K.T., P.C., G.C.S.I., G.C.I.E., LL.D., *PRESIDENT, Carolside, Earlston, Berwickshire; 35 Berkeley Square, W. 1.*
- 1897 \*REUTER, J. N., Ph.D., 21 *Fabriksgatan, Helsingfors, Finland.*
- 1879 RICE, Benjamin Lewis, C.I.E., *Greenhalgh, Maxted Park, Harrow.*
- 560 1910 \*RICHARDS, F. J., M.A., I.C.S., *c/o Grindlay & Co., 54 Parliament St., S.W. 1.*
- 1919 RICKETT, C. B., 27 *Kendrick Road, Reading.*
- 1896 \*RICKMERS, Mrs. W. R., 30a *Sackville St., W. 1.*
- 1892 †RIDDING, Miss C. Mary, *University Library, Cambridge.*
- 1893 \*†RIDDING, Rev. W. Caldecott, 52 *Waterloo Rd., Wolverhampton.*
- 1872 \*†RIVETT-CARNAC, Colonel J. H., C.I.E., F.S.A., *Hôtel des Trois Couronnes, Vevey, Switzerland.*
- 1907 \*ROBB, George, *Egyptian Civil Service, Turf Club, Cairo, Egypt.*
- 1910 \*ROBERTSON, Rev. Alexander, M.A., *United Free Church Mission, 1 Staveley Rd., Poona, India.*
- 1919 ROCKSTRO, F. Braine, *Tindale House, Cromer Rd., Queen's Park, Bournemouth.*
- 1919 ROOKE, Mortimer, 54 *Eccleston Square, S.W. 1.*
- 570 1905 \*ROSE, H. A., I.C.S. (ret.), *Royal Societies' Club, St. James' St., S.W. 1.*
- 1894 ROSS, Sir Edward Denison, K.C.I.E., Ph.D., *School of Oriental Studies, Finsbury Circus, E. C. 2.*

- 1912 \*ROSS, G. R. T., M.A., I.E.S., *Professor of Philosophy, Rangoon College, Burma.*
- 1891 \*†ROUSE, W. H. D., Litt. D., *Head Master, Perse School, Cambridge.*
- 1916 \*ROY, Sateendranarayan, M.A., B.L., *High Court Fakil, Lakshmannath P.O., Balasore, Orissa, India.*
- 1916 \*ROY, Srijut Jamini Kishore, M.A., *Munsif, Sherpur Town, Mymensingh, Bengal.*
- 1872 \*†RUSTOMJI, C., *Jaunpur, India.*
- 1918 RYLANDS, W. Harry, F.S.A., *1 Campden Hill Place, W. 11.*
- HON. 1887 SACHAU, Kgl. Geheimer Regierungsrat, Professor Eduard, *Director of the Seminar für Orientalische Sprachen, Berlin.*
- 1918 \*SAHA, Babu Joymongol, B.A., B.L., *Asst. Head-Master, Ujanchar • K.N.H.E. School, P.O. Ujanchar, Tippera Dt., Bengal*
- 580 1917 \*SAHA, Radhika N., *Chowmatha, Chinsurah, Bengal.*
- 1918 \*SAHA, Vidyanath, *Professor, Dyal Singh College, Lahore, Punjab, India.*
- 1917 \*SAHNI, Rai Sahib Daya Ram, M.A., *Superintendent Archaeological Survey, Lahore, Panjab, India.*
- 1904 \*SAID-RUETE, Rudolph, *10 Kapuzinerweg, Lucerne, Switzerland.*
- 1917 \*SALARIYA, Sardar Gurdial Singh, *King's Inns, Dublin.*
- HON. 1908 SALEMANN, Professor C., *Director, Asiatic Museum, Petrograd, Russia.*
- 1919 SALLAWAY, W. J. S., *49 Fellows Rd., N.W. 3.*
- 1915 \*SAMADDAR, Professor Jogindranath, *Bihar and Orissa Research Society, Bankipore, India.*
- 1914 \*SANDHU, Narain Singh, M.A., *Namtu, Upper Burma.*
- 1899 \*SANDHURST, The Right Hon. Lord, P.C., G.C.S.I., G.C.I.E., *60 Eaton Square, S.W. 1.*
- 590 1916 \*SANYAL, Jitendranath, Zemindar, B.A., *199, Ramapura, Benares City, India.*
- 1895 \*SARAWAK, H.H. the Ranees of, *Grey Friars, Ascot.*
- 1891 \*†SARDA, Har Bilas, B.A., *Guardian to H.H. the Maharawal of Jaisalmer, Ajmere, India.*
- 1908 \*SARKAR, Suresa Chandra, M.A., *Sub-Div. Officer, Sadar, Muzaffarpur, Behar, India.*

- 1904 \*SARRUF, Dr. Y., *Editor of al-Muktataf, Cairo, Egypt.*
- 1902 †SASSOON, David Solomon, *Malabar Hill, Bombay;*  
32 Bruton St., W. 1.
- 1880 HON. 1906 §SATOW, The Right Hon. Sir Ernest M.,  
G.C.M.G., Ph.D., *Beaumont, Ottery St. Mary,*  
*Devon.*
- 1919 SAYCE, Rev. A. B., *Woodlands Vicarage, Frome,*  
*Somerset.*
- 1874 †§SAYCE, Rev. A. H., D.Litt., LL.D., D.D., HON. VICE-  
PRESIDENT, *Professor of Assyriology, Queen's*  
*College, Oxford; 8 Chalmers Crescent, Edinburgh.*
- 1905 \*SCHRADER, Friedrich Otto, Ph.D., *c/o Theosophical*  
*Society, Adyar, Madras.*
- 600 1903 \*SEDDON, Charles Norman, *c/o Messrs. King, King & Co.,*  
*Bombay.*
- 1913 SEESODIA, Thakur Shri Jessrajsinghj, 17 Bury St.,  
W. C. 1.
- 1867 \*†SELIM, Faris Effendi, *Constantinople, Turkey.*
- 1915 \*SELJUQI, Khan Mahomed Hayat Khan, B.A., *Foreign*  
*Secretary to H.H. the Maharaja Scindia of Gwalior,*  
*Laskar, Central India.*
- 1887 \*SELL, Rev. Canon E., K.-i.-H., *Church Mission House,*  
*Egmore, Madras.*
- HON. 1892 SENART, Émile, 18 Rue François 1<sup>er</sup>, Paris,  
France.
- 1916 \*SETH, Madan Mohun, M.A., LL.B., *Munsif, Jhansi,*  
*U.P., India.*
- 1877 §SEWELL, R., I.C.S. (ret.), *c/o Messrs. H. S. King & Co.,*  
9 Pall Mall, S. W. 1.
- 1918 \*SHAH, Ikbal Ali, Medical Student, Edinburgh  
University, *University Union, Edinburgh.*
- 1909 \*SHAMASASTRY, R., B.A., *Curator, Govt. Oriental*  
*Library, Mysore, India.*
- 610 1913 \*SHANKAR, Gauri, *Ludhiana, Panjab, India.*
- 1915 \*SHANKAR, Pandit Maya, B.A., *Comptroller of Accounts,*  
*Bharatpur State, Rajputana, India.*
- 1917 \*SHARMA, Pandit Kedar Natha, *Editor of Kavya-Mala,*  
*Jaipur, India.*
- 1918 \*SHASTRI, Hirananda, *Superintendent of Archaeology,*  
*Jammu and Kashmir State, Srinagar, Kashmir,*  
*India.*



- 1912 \*SHASTRI, Mahamahopadhyaya Goswami Pandit Har  
Narain, *Professor, Hindu College, Neel-Katra,  
Delhi, India.*
- 1912 \*SHEERATT, Rev. W., *British and Foreign Bible Society,  
Rangoon, Burma.*
- 1914 \*SHUTTLEWORTH, H. L., I.C.S., *Settlement Officer, Kulu,  
Panjab, India.*
- 1919 SIBREE, Ernest, *48 Manor Park, Redland, Bristol.*
- 1910 \*SIMON, Professor Dr. Richard, *Siegfriedstrasse 10,  
Munich, Bavaria.*
- 1910 SIMPSON, Mrs. Alicia Hall, *c/o Sir C. R. McGrigor & Co.,  
39 Panton St., W.C. 2.*
- 620 1914 \*SIMPSON, Rev. D. C., M.A., *Manchester College,  
Oxford.*
- 1917 \*SINGH, Babu Anirudha Prasad, *Panjiwara P.O.,  
S. Bhagalpur, B. & O., India.*
- 1907 \*SINGH, Kahan, Sirdar of Nabha, *P.O. Mandi Phul,  
via Bhatinda, N.W. Railway, India.*
- 1914 \*SINGH, Lala Gulbahar, M.A., LL.B., *Professor of  
Sanskrit, Government College, Lahore, Panjab, India.*
- 1902 \*†SINGH, Raja Pertab Bahadur Singh, C.I.E., *of Tiraul,  
Partabgarh, Oudh, India.*
- 1911 \*†SINGH, H.H. Maharaja Ripudaman, *Nabha, Panjab,  
India.*
- 1917 \*SINGH, Sahibzada Bhagat Lakshman, *Government High  
School, Ferozapore City, Panjab, India.*
- 1917 \*SINGH, Sahibzada Sher, M.Sc., *Professor Khalsa  
College, Amritsar, India.*
- 1913 \*SINHA, Babu Rudra Datta, M.A., LL.B., *Vakil,  
High Court, Lucknow, India.*
- 1895 \*†SINHA, Kunwar Keshal Pal, *Raio Kotla, P.O. Narki,  
Agra, U.P., India.*
- 630 1918 \*SITARAMAN, K. N., B.A., *Research Scholar, University  
of Madras.*
- 1900 \*SKEAT, W. W., *17 Coombe Road, Croydon.*
- 1883 \*§SMITH, Vincent A., C.I.E., Litt.D., M.A. (VICE-  
PRESIDENT), *6 Fyfield Rd., Oxford.*
- HON. 1909 SNOUCK HURGRONJE, Professor C., *Witte Singel  
84a, Leiden, Holland.*
- 1907 SOANE, Maj. E. B., *c/o Messrs. H. S. King & Co.,  
9 Pall Mall, S.W. 1.*

- 1915 \*SOM, Atul Chandra, B.A., *Land Acquisition Officer, Chaibasa P.O., Singhbhum, India.*
- 1912 \*SOOD, Babu Hira Lal, *Sub-Judge, Kotah, Rajputana, India.*
- 1916 \*SOWERBY, Lieut. E. S., R.A.M.C., *c/o A. Archard, Esq., Sunny Mount, Beechen Cliff, Bath.*
- 1910 \*SPOONER, D. B., Ph.D., *Asst. Director General, Archaeological Survey, Benmore, Simla, E. India.*
- 1908 \*SPOONER, Mrs. D. B., *Benmore, Simla, E. India.*
- 640 1918 \*SRIKANTAIYA, S., B.A., B.L., *Bangalore City, S. India.*
- 1916 \*SRINIVASAN, R., M.A., *Professor of Mathematics, H.H. Maharaja's College, Trivandrum, South India.*
- 1914 \*SRINIVASARAO, Karpur, B.Sc., *Chief Engineer, Mysore Government, Bangalore, South India.*
- 1910 \*STÄEL-HOLSTEIN, Baron A. von, *4 Tučkova Naberežnaya, Petrograd, Russia.*
- 1919 STANTON, J., *High Street, Chorley, Lancs.*
- 1907 \*STAPLETON, H. E., Ind. Educ. Serv., *c/o Director of Public Instruction, Bengal, Writers' Buildings, Calcutta.*
- 1909 \*STARK, Herbert A., *Additional Asst. Director of Public Instruction in Bengal, Writers' Buildings, Calcutta.*
- 1904 \*STEEL, Mrs., *Roycot, Stansted, Essex.*
- 1887 \*§STEIN, Sir Aurel, K.C.I.E., Ph.D., D.Litt., D.Sc., *Superintendent, Indian Archaeological Survey, Srinagar, Kashmir, India.*
- 1916 \*STEPHEN, Sir Harry Lushington, *65 Grange Rd., Cambridge.*
- 650 1905 \*STEVENS, George F. A., *Tehran, Persia.*
- 1912 \*STEWART, J. A., I.C.S., *c/o Messrs. T. Cook & Son, Rangoon, Burma.*
- 1906 \*STOKES, H. G., C.I.E., I.C.S., *c/o Chief Secretary to Government, Madras.*
- 1915 \*STOREY, C. A., *The Library, India Office, S.W. 1.*
- 1912 \*STRAUSS, Dr. Otto, *The University, Calcutta.*
- 1900 \*STURGE, P. H., M.A., *Principal and Professor of History, Nizam's College, Haidarabad, India.*
- 1909 \*SUBBAIYA, K. V., M.A., *University Reader in Dravidian Philology, Madras University, Asst. Inspector of Schools, Ramnad, Madras.*

- 1917 \*SUBBARAYEN, Parama Siva, *Wadham College, Oxford.*
- 1918 \*SUBRAHMANYAM, Palamadai Pichumoni, Sastri, *Balliol College, Oxford.*
- 1919 SUFI, Ghulam Mohi-ud-Din, B.A., *Superintendent Normal School, Amraoti, Berar, India.*
- 660 1917 \*SURYANARAYANAM, Satalur Sundara, *Lalagraharam, Madura, S. India.*
- 1917 \*SURYANARAYANARAO, T., *Sanskrit College, Kovur, Godavery Banks, Madras Presidency.*
- 1893 \*†SVASTI SOBHANA, H.R.H. Prince, *Bangkok, Siam.*
- 1895\*†§SYKES, Brigadier-General Sir Percy Molesworth, K.C.I.E., C.M.G., *Elcombs, Lyndhurst, Hants.*
- 1910 \*TABARD, Rev. Father A. M., *The Cathedral, Shooley, Bangalore, South India.*
- 1915 \*TAGORE, Babu Kshitendra Nath, B.A., 6/1 *Dwarkanath Tagore Lane, East Gate, Jorasanko, Calcutta.*
- 1875 \*†TAGORE, Rajah Bahadur Sir Sourendro Mohun, C.I.E., Mus.D., *Calcutta.*
- 1912 \*TAHOOR, Gholam, *Interpreter and Translator, High Court, 44B Police Hospital Rd., Calcutta, India.*
- 1896 \*TAKAKUSU, Jyan, Ph.D., 902 *Sendagaya, Tokyo, Japan.*
- 1897 \*TALBOT, Walter Stanley, C.I.E., *c/o Messrs. King and Co., 9 Pall Mall, S.W. 1.*
- 670 HON. 1910 TALLQVIST, K. L., *Professor of Oriental Literatures, Fabriksgasse 21, Helsingfors, Finland.*
- 1913 \*TAMBYAH, T. Isaac, *Barrister-at-Law, 18 Beach St., Penang, Malay Peninsula.*
- 1914 \*†TAMPI, Vattasseril Sri Velayudhan, son of H.H. the Maharaja of Travancore, *Trivandrum, Travancore, South India.*
- 1909 \*TANCOCK, Major A. C., I.A., 31st *Panjabis, Parachinar, Kurram Valley, N.W.F.P., India.*
- 1912 \*TANNAN, Mohan Lall, *Barrister-at-Law, Sydenham College Hostel, Chami Rd., Bombay, 4.*
- 1916 \*TANTRARATNA, Nutu Gopal, *Lalgola P. O., Murshidabad Dt., Bengal.*
- 1918 \*TARINI-CHARAN-RATH, B.A., *Dt. Munsif, Ongole, Guntur Dt., Madras Pres.*
- 1897 \*TATE, George P., *Indian Survey Department, Dudley Grove, Naini Tal, U.P., India.*

- 1893 \*TAW SEIN KO, K.-i-H., I.S.O., *West Moat Rd., Mandalay, Burma.*
- 1911 \*†TEAPE, Rev. William Marshall, M.A., *South Hylton Vicarage, Sunderland.*
- 680 1879 \*§TEMPLE, Colonel Sir R. C., Bart., C.I.E., *The Nash, Worcester.*
- 1898 \*THATCHER, Rev. G.W., M.A., *Camden College, Sydney, N.S.W.*
- 1905 \*THIRTLE, James William, LL.D., 23 *Borthwick Rd., Stratford, E. 15.*
- 1917 \*THOMAS, E. J., M.A., *Under Librarian, University Library, Cambridge.*
- 1898 §THOMAS, F. W., Ph.D., *Librarian, India Office, S.W. 1; Hawk Hill, Chaldon, Caterham, Surrey.*
- 1918 THOMPSON, Sir Herbert, Bart., 9 *Kensington Park Gardens, W. 11.*
- 1907 \*THOMPSON, J. P., I.C.S., *c/o Messrs. Grindlay & Co., 54 Parliament St., S.W. 1.*
- 1919 \*THOMPSON, R. C. Campbell, M.A., F.S.A., *Milburn Lodge, Boar's Hill, Oxford.*
- HON. 1909 THOMSEN, Professor Dr. Vilhelm, *St. Knuds Vej 36, Copenhagen, Denmark.*
- 1889 †§THOMSON, H. Lyon, F.S.A.
- 690 1880 \*†THORBURN, S. S., *Bracknell House, Bracknell, Berks.*
- 1912 \*THORNTON, H. A., *Superintendent, Northern Shan States, Lashio, Burma.*
- 1859 \*†TIEN, Rev. Anton, D.D., Ph.D., 22 *Chesterford Gardens, N.W. 3.*
- 1919 \*TILAK, Raghukul, F.R.E.S., *Anderkote, Meerut City, U.P., India.*
- 1903 \*TILBE, Rev. H. H., Ph.D., *Upper Alton, Illinois, U.S.A.; American Baptist Mission, Riverview, Ahlone, Burma.*
- 1895 \*†TRAVANCORE, H.H. Maharaj Raja Sir Bala Rama Varma Bahadur, G.C.S.I., G.C.I.E.
- 1917 \*TRIPATHI, Professor Deva Datta, Sahityacharya, *Patna College, Bankipore, B. & O., India.*
- 1918 \*TRIPATHI, Pandit Ram Prasad, *Reader in Modern Indian History, University of Allahabad, India.*
- 1919 TROTTER, Miss Eleanor, *The High School, Darlington.*

- 1884 TROTTER, Lieut.-Colonel Sir Henry, K.C.M.G., C.B.,  
18 *Eaton Place, S.W. 1.*
- 700 1912 \*TROUP, James, *Woodcroft, Gervis Road East, Bourn  
mouth.*
- 1902 \*TSAIN, Moung, *Pegu, Burma.*
- 1900 \*TUCKWELL, Rev. John, 1 *Onslow Gardens, Muswell  
Hill, N. 10.*
- 1912 \*TURNER, Professor R. L., *c/o W. S. Armour, Esq.,  
Queen's College, Benares, India.*
- 1908 \*Ū, Maung Mya, *Barrister-at-Law, Henzada, Burma.*
- 1882 \*UDAIPUR-MEWAR, H.H. Maharaja Dhiraja Maharana  
Sir Fateh Singh Bahadur, G.C.S.I., G.C.I.E.,  
G.C.V.O., *Rajputana, India.*
- 1919 U, Professor H., *c/o Sōtōshū Daigaku Komanzawa  
Mura, Tokyo-fu, Japan.*
- 1917 \*VACHASPATI, Indra Vidya, *Professor, Gurukala Uni-  
versity, Kangri Dt., Bijnor, U.P., India.*
- 1919 \*VAISHYA, Ramji Das, F.R.S.A., *Sweet Cottage,  
Gwalior, India.*
- HON. 1898 VAJIRANĀNA, H.R.H. Prince, *Pavaranivesa  
Vihāra, Bangkok, Siam.*
- 710 1907 \*VARMA, H.H. Sir Sri Rama, G.C.S.I., G.C.I.E.,  
*Cochin, S. India.*
- 1884 \*VASUDEV, Mādhav Samarth, R. R., B.A.
- 1913 \*VIDYABHUSANA, Pandit Upendranath, M.A., *Senior  
Professor of Sanskrit, City College, Calcutta.*
- 1899 \*VIDYĀBHŪṢAṆA, Satis Chandra Āchārya, M.A., Ph.D.,  
*Principal, Sanskrit College, College Square, Calcutta.*
- 1907 \*VIDYARATNA, Pandit Krishna Pada, 1 *Simla St.,  
Calcutta.*
- 1917 \*VIDYARATNA, Vaidya Pandit Ramchandra, *Hon. Asst.  
Curator, Government Museum of Archaeology,  
Muttra, U.P., India.*
- 1905 \*VOGEL, J. Ph., Ph.D., *Professor at the University,  
Leiden, Holland.*
- 1899 \*VOST, Lieut.-Colonel W., I.M.S., *The Club, Secun-  
derabad, Deccan, India.*

- 1908 \*WACKERNAGEL, Dr. Jakob, *Professor of Comparative Philology, Göttingen University; Hoher Weg 12, Göttingen, Germany.*
- 1892 †WADDELL, Lieut.-Colonel L. A., C.B., C.I.E., LL.D., I.M.S., 33 *The Park, North End Rd., N.W. 3.*
- 720 1914 \*WAHID, Maulvi Syed Abdul, M.A., *Professor Mayo College, Ajmer, India.*
- 1912 \*WAHSHAT, Raza Ali, Sahib-i-Diwan, 2/1/2 *Tilgala 1st Lane, P.O. Ballygunge, Calcutta.*
- 1912 \*†WALKER, Rev. C. T. Harley, M.A., 28 *Warnborough Rd., Oxford.*
- 1908 \*WALLESER, Professor Dr. Max, *Mannheim, C. 7. 14, Germany.*
- 1907 \*WALSH, E. H. C., C.S.I., I.C.S., *Member, Board of Revenue, Bankipur, India.*
- 1912 \*WAR OFFICE. *Officer in Charge, Far Eastern Sub-section, Whitehall, S.W. 1.*
- 1919 WARBURTON, Rev. B. A., 90 *Billinge Rd., Spring Bank, Wigan.*
- 1916 \*WARDROP, Oliver, M.A., *Belmont, Sevenoaks.*
- 1914 \*WARMING, Colonel P. L. E., *Bangkok, Siam.*
- 1907 \*WATSON, H. D., I.C.S., *Gurdaspur, Panjab, India.*
- 730 1900 \*WEIR, T. H., B.D., *Rockcliff, Bowling, Dumbartonshire.*
- 1882 WHINFIELD, E. H., *St. Margaret's, Beulah Hill, S.E. 19.*
- 1906 \*WHITEHEAD, R. B., I.C.S., *Lahore, India.*
- 1919 \*WICKHAM, H. T., Indian Police, *Bank House, Bawtry, Yorks; Mianwali, Panjab, India.*
- 1899 \*WICKREMASINGHE, Don M. de Zilva, *Indian Institute, Oxford; 13 St. Margaret's Rd., Oxford.*
- 1911 \*WIJEWARDENE, Don Richard, *Rickman House, Colpetty, Colombo, Ceylon.*
- 1916 \*WILBERFORCE-BELL, Maj. H., *Isthmian Club, 105 Piccadilly, W. 1.*
- 1913 \*WILDER, Rev. George Albert, M.A., D.D., *Chicore Mission Station, Chipinga P.O., Melsetter Dt., Rhodesia, South Africa.*
- 1915 \*WILLIAMS, L. F. Rushbrook, B.A., B.Litt., 3 *Cawnpore Rd., Allahabad, India.*
- 1919 WILLIS, G. de L., *Leconfield Estate Office, Ennis, Co. Clare.*

- 740 1919 WILLS, J. T., 6 *Mortlake Rd., Kew.*  
 1919 \*WINCKWORTH, Chauncey, *Fitzwilliam Hall, Cambridge.*  
 1919 WINCKWORTH, W. F., 36 *Addison Rd., W. 14.*  
 1912 \*WINSTEDT, R. O., *Asst. Director of Education, Kuala Lumpur, Federated Malay States.*  
 1876 †§WOLLASTON, Sir Arthur N., K.C.I.E., *Glen Hill, Walmer, Kent.*  
 1896 \*WOOD, J. Elmsley, 4 *Glenisla Gardens, Edinburgh.*  
 1907 \*WOODLEY, Rev. Edward Carruthers, *American Mission Seminary, Marash, Turkey in Asia.*  
 1919 \*WOOLLEY, Capt. C. Leonard, V.C., R.F.A., *Great Riffhams, Danbury, Essex.*  
 1909 \*WOODS, Professor James H., Ph.D., *Harvard University, 179 Brattle St., Cambridge, Mass., U.S.A.*  
 1906 \*WOOLNER, A. C., M.A., *Principal, Oriental College and Registrar, Panjab University, Lahore, India.*  
 750 1900 \*WORKMAN, Mrs. Bullock, *c/o Messrs. Brown, Shipley and Co., 123 Pall Mall, S.W. 1.*  
 1894 \*WRIGHT, H. Nelson, I.C.S., *Pirwood, Clevedon, Somerset.*  
  
 1911 \*YAZDANI MAS'UDI, Ghulam, *Superintendent of Archaeology, Nizam's Dominions, Hyderabad, Deccan, India.*  
 1910 YETTS, Major W. Perceval, *Junior United Service Club, Charles St., S.W. 1.*  
 1913 \*YUSOOF, S. Azhar, *Yusoof Manzil, Civil Lines, Gaya, Bengal.*  
 1895 YUSUF-ALI, Abdullah ibn, C.B.E., I.C.S., M.A., LL.M., *3 Bedford Rd., Bedford Park, W. 4.*  
  
 1908 \*ZAN, Maung Aung, K.S.M., *District Judge, West View, 6 Sandwith Rd., Rangoon, Burma.*  
 757 1913 \*ZIMMERMANN, Rev. Robert, S.J., *St. Xavier's College, Cruickshank Rd., Bombay.*

### Honorary Members

- |    |      |  |
|----|------|--|
|    | 1906 | Professor René Basset, <i>Algiers</i> .                                      |
|    | 1885 | Sir Ramkrishna Gopal Bhandarkar, K.C.I.E., C.S.I.,<br><i>Poona, Bombay</i> . |
|    | 1913 | Leone Caetani, Principe di Teano, <i>Rome</i> .                              |
|    | 1919 | Rt. Rev. L. C. Casartelli, Bp. of Salford.                                   |
| 5  | 1893 | Professor Henri Cordier, <i>Paris</i> .                                      |
|    | 1908 | Professor Friedrich Delitzsch, <i>Berlin</i> .                               |
|    | 1918 | Monsieur A. Foucher, <i>Paris</i> .  |
|    | 1893 | Professor Ignaz Goldziher, <i>Budapest</i> .                                 |
|    | 1898 | Professor Ignace Guidi, <i>Rome</i> .  |
| 10 | 1902 | Professor Houtsma, <i>Utrecht</i> .  |
|    | 1912 | Professor Hermann Jacobi, <i>Bonn</i> .                                      |
|    | 1904 | Professor Julius Jolly, <i>Würzburg</i> .                                    |
|    | 1899 | Professor J. Ritter von Karabaček, <i>Vienna</i> .                           |
|    | 1909 | Professor Ernst Kuhn, <i>Munich</i> .  |
| 15 | 1902 | Professor Lanman, <i>Cambridge, Mass.</i>                                    |
|    | 1916 | Professor Sylvain Lévi, <i>Paris</i> .                                       |
|    | 1895 | Professor Ed. Naville, <i>Geneva</i> .                                       |
|    | 1890 | Professor T. Nöldeke, <i>Strassburg</i> .                                    |
|    | 1908 | Professor Hermann Oldenberg, <i>Göttingen</i> .                              |
| 20 | 1901 | Professor Dr. V. Radloff, <i>Petrograd</i> .                                 |
|    | 1887 | Professor Eduard Sachau, <i>Berlin</i> .                                     |
|    | 1908 | Professor Carl Salemann, <i>Petrograd</i> .                                  |
|    | 1906 | Sir Ernest Satow, G.C.M.G.   |
|    | 1892 | Monsieur Émile Senart, <i>Paris</i> .  |
| 25 | 1909 | Professor C. Snouck Hurgronje, <i>Leiden</i> .                               |
|    | 1910 | Professor K. L. Tallqvist, <i>Helsingfors</i> .                              |
|    | 1909 | Professor Vilhelm Thomsen, <i>Copenhagen</i> .                               |
| 28 | 1898 | H.R.H. Prince Vajirāñāna, <i>Bangkok</i> .                                   |

### Extraordinary Member

- |      |  |
|------|--|
| 1910 | H.E. Sir Abul Kasim Khan, G.C.M.G., <i>Nasir-ul-Mulk</i> . |
|------|--|

*Note.*—The number of Honorary Members is limited by Rule 9 to thirty.



### Gold Medallists

N.B.—The Gold Medal was founded in 1897.

- 1897 Professor E. B. Cowell.
- 1900 E. W. West.
- 1903 Sir William Muir.
- 1906 G. U. Pope.
- 1909 G. A. Grierson.
- 1912 J. F. Fleet.
- 1915 { Mrs. Agnes Smith Lewis.  
Mrs. Margaret Dunlop Gibson.
- 1918 V. A. Smith.

# LIST OF LIBRARIES AND NON-MEMBERS

## SUBSCRIBING TO THE JOURNAL OF THE ROYAL ASIATIC SOCIETY

- ABERDEEN. UNIVERSITY LIBRARY.
- ABERYSTWITH. UNIVERSITY OF WALES.
- ADYAR LIBRARY, Adyar, Madras.
- AJMERE. MAYO COLLEGE.
- ALIGARH. LYTTON LIBRARY, M.A.O. College.
- ATHENÆUM CLUB.
- BALTIMORE. JOHNS HOPKINS UNIVERSITY LIBRARY.
- BALTIMORE. PEABODY INSTITUTE.
- BANGKOK. VAJIRANĀNA NATIONAL LIBRARY.
- 10 BANKIPORE. B.N. COLLEGE.
- BENARES. HINDU UNIVERSITY.
- BENARES. QUEEN'S COLLEGE.
- BERKELEY. THE PACIFIC SCHOOL OF RELIGION.
- BIRMINGHAM. PUBLIC LIBRARY.
- BOMBAY. UNIVERSITY LIBRARY.
- BRIGHTON. PUBLIC LIBRARY. (H. D. Roberts, Chief Librarian.)
- BRITISH MUSEUM.
- CAIRO. INSPECTION LIBRARY OF THE MINISTRY OF EDUCATION.
- CAIRO. INSTITUT FRANÇAIS.
- 20 CAIRO. SULTANIA TRAINING COLLEGE.
- CALCUTTA. IMPERIAL LIBRARY.
- CALCUTTA. INDIAN MUSEUM, ARCHÆOLOGICAL SECTION.
- CALCUTTA. MADRASAH.
- CALCUTTA. PRESIDENCY COLLEGE.
- CALCUTTA. RIPON COLLEGE.
- CALCUTTA. UNIVERSITY LIBRARY.
- CALCUTTA. SANSKRIT COLLEGE.
- CALCUTTA. SCOTTISH CHURCHES' COLLEGE.
- CALCUTTA. ST. XAVIER'S COLLEGE.
- 30 CHESTER, PA. BUCKNELL LIBRARY.
- CHICAGO. HIBBARD EGYPTIAN LIBRARY.
- CHICAGO. NEWBERRY LIBRARY.

- CHICAGO. UNIVERSITY LIBRARY.  
 CINCINNATI. PUBLIC LIBRARY.  
 CLEVELAND. ADELBERT COLLEGE LIBRARY.  
 CLEVELAND. PUBLIC LIBRARY.  
 COPENHAGEN. ROYAL LIBRARY.  
 COPENHAGEN. UNIVERSITY LIBRARY.  
 CORNELL UNIVERSITY, Ithaca, New York.
- 40 DACCA. JUGANNATH COLLEGE.  
 DETROIT. PUBLIC LIBRARY.  
 EAST INDIA UNITED SERVICE CLUB.  
 EDINBURGH. PUBLIC LIBRARY.  
 EDINBURGH. ROYAL SCOTTISH MUSEUM.  
 ERNAKULAM. STATE MUSEUM OF COCHIN.  
 FLORENCE. BIBLIOTECA NAZIONALE.  
 GAUHATI. COTTON COLLEGE.  
 GENEVA. BIBLIOTHÈQUE PUBLIQUE.  
 GLASGOW. MITCHELL LIBRARY.
- 50 GUPTA, Babu Siva Prasad, Benares.  
 GWALIOR STATE. INSPECTOR OF ARCHÆOLOGY.  
 HAIDARABAD. STATE LIBRARY.  
 HARVARD COLLEGE LIBRARY.  
 HONG KONG. UNIVERSITY.  
 HOSOKAWA, M., Esq., Tokyo.  
 INDIA. BUREAU OF EDUCATION.  
 ISHIHAMO, J., Esq., Osaka.  
 JEWISH THEOLOGICAL SEMINARY OF AMERICA.  
 JODHPUR. MARWAR MUSEUM AND LIBRARY.
- 60 JUNAGADH ARCHÆOLOGICAL SOCIETY, Kathiawar.  
 KANAZAWA, JAPAN. FOURTH HIGH SCHOOL.  
 KHARTOUM. DIRECTOR OF EDUCATION, SUDAN GOVERNMENT.  
 KYOTO. INDIAN PHILOSOPHY.  
 LAHORE. DAYANAND ANGLO-VEDIC COLLEGE.  
 LAHORE. DYAL SINGH LIBRARY TRUST.  
 LAHORE. FORMAN CHRISTIAN COLLEGE.  
 LAHORE. PANJAB PUBLIC LIBRARY.  
 LAHORE UNIVERSITY.

- LAHORE. PANJAB VEDIC LIBRARY.
- 70 LIVERPOOL. THE ATHENÆUM.  
LIVERPOOL. INSTITUTE OF ARCHÆOLOGY.  
LONDON LIBRARY.  
LONDON. SCIENCE LIBRARY.  
LOUISVILLE, KY. S. BAPTIST THEOLOGICAL SEMINARY.  
LUCKNOW. CANNING COLLEGE.  
LUCKNOW. PROVINCIAL MUSEUM.  
LUCKNOW. PUBLIC LIBRARY.  
LUND. KUNGL. UNIVERSITETS BIBLIOTEKET.  
MADRAS. ARCHÆOLOGICAL SURVEY.
- 80 MADRAS. CONNEMARA PUBLIC LIBRARY.  
MADRAS. KUMBAKONAM COLLEGE.  
MADRAS. NATIONAL COLLEGE OF COMMERCE.  
MADRAS. ORIENTAL MANUSCRIPTS LIBRARY.  
MADRAS. PRESIDENCY COLLEGE.  
MANCHESTER. FREE REFERENCE LIBRARY.  
MANCHESTER. JOHN RYLANDS LIBRARY.  
MANCHESTER. LANCASHIRE INDEPENDENT COLLEGE.  
MANCHESTER UNIVERSITY.  
MANDALAY. BURMA ARCHÆOLOGICAL SURVEY.
- 90 MANILA. BUREAU OF SCIENCE.  
MEADVILLE. ALLEGHANY COLLEGE LIBRARY, PA.  
MELBOURNE. VICTORIA PUBLIC LIBRARY.  
MOSCOW. LIBRARY CASTEREN.  
MYSORE ARCHÆOLOGICAL OFFICE, Bangalore.  
MYSORE. GOVERNMENT ORIENTAL LIBRARY.  
MYSORE. MAHARAJA'S COLLEGE UNION.  
MYSORE. UNIVERSITY LIBRARY.  
NEWCASTLE-ON-TYNE. PUBLIC LIBRARY.  
NEW YORK. JEWISH THEOLOGICAL LIBRARY.
- 100 NEW YORK LIBRARY, Missionary Research Library.  
NEW YORK CITY. UNION THEOLOGICAL SEMINARY.  
OTTAWA. LIBRARY OF PARLIAMENT.  
OXFORD. THE INDIAN INSTITUTE.  
OXFORD. ST. JOHN'S COLLEGE.

- PARIS. BANQUE INDUSTRIELLE DE CHINE.
- PARIS. BIBLIOTHÈQUE DU MINISTÈRE DE COLONIES.
- PARIS. INSTITUT DE FRANCE.
- PATNA. BIHAR AND ORISSA RESEARCH SOCIETY.
- PAVIA. UNIVERSITÀ.
- 110 PESHAWAR. ARCHÆOLOGICAL SURVEY OF INDIA, FRONTIER CIRCLE.
- PHILADELPHIA. COMMERCIAL MUSEUM. \*
- PHILADELPHIA LIBRARY COMPANY.
- PITTSBURG. CARNEGIE LIBRARY.
- PITTSBURG. WESTERN THEOLOGICAL SEMINARY.
- POONA. ARCHÆOLOGICAL SURVEY, WESTERN CIRCLE.
- POONA. FERGUSSON COLLEGE.
- PRINCETON. THEOLOGICAL SEMINARY.
- ROME. BIBLIOTECA APOSTOLICA VATICANA.
- ROME. BIBLIOTECA NAZIONALE.
- 120 SEATTLE. UNIVERSITY OF WASHINGTON LIBRARY.
- SRINAGAR. SRI PRATAP SINGH MUSEUM.
- STATIONARY OFFICE.
- STOCKHOLM. ROYAL LIBRARY. \*
- STRASBOURG. BIBLIOTHÈQUE UNIVERSITAIRE ET REGIONALE.
- SYLHET. MURARICHAND COLLEGE.
- TINNEVELLY. HINDU COLLEGE.
- TOKYO. INSTITUTE OF HISTORY, IMPERIAL UNIVERSITY.
- TOKYO. DR. G. E. MORRISON LIBRARY.
- TOKYO. NOSHOMU.
- 130 TOKYO. SHŪKYO-DAIGAKU LIBRARY.
- TRICHINOPOLY. ST. JOSEPH'S COLLEGE.
- UTRECHT. UNIVERSITY LIBRARY.
- VALKENBERG. IGNATIUS COLLEGE.
- VARARIDDHI, H.R.H. Prince NARES, Bangkok.
- VIZIANAGRAM. MAHARAJAH'S COLLEGE.
- VIZIANAGRAM. MAHARAJA'S SANSKRIT COLLEGE.
- WINNIPEG. UNIVERSITY OF MANITOBA.
- 138 ZURICH. BIBLIOTHÈQUE CENTRALE.

*Note.*—There are other libraries which subscribe through the booksellers. The Secretary would be much obliged by the Librarians of such libraries sending their names to be added to the above list.

CENTRAL ARCHAEOLOGICAL LIBRARY  
GOVT. OF INDIA  
Department of Archaeology  
NEW DELHI

Please help us to keep the book  
clean and moving.

---